THEOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX DECEMBER, 1939 No. 234

EDITORIAL

THERE are surely many people who, as they prepare to sing about "peace on earth and goodwill towards men," will wonder whether they are going to be guilty of sentimentality or of hypocrisy. The misgiving is due in large part, we believe, to the circumstance that the "peace on earth," which is proclaimed in the Gospel, is popularly taken to mean universal and harmonious brotherhood among the citizens of this world. Thus the Gospel is regarded as the charter of humanitarian idealism, and the Christ is regarded as the herald of an earthly utopia. To assert the presence or the imminence of that would be playing with words, even when allowance has been made for the poetic licence that may be granted to the authors of Christmas carols. A profound, if plausible, misunderstanding underlies the equation of the evangelic "peace on earth" with a state of international harmony. The peace of which the New Testament is full had little to do with the *pax romana*, which is the counterpart of the peace that is uppermost in men's hopes to-day. Nor, on the other hand, was it a mystical peace to be acquired by detachment from the cares and conflicts that inevitably beset those who take their part in the affairs of this world.

* * * * *

The peace proclaimed in the Gospel is neither an ideal nor a dream; it is an eschatological reality. It is neither present nor future deliverance from wars without and conflicts within; it is final deliverance from the fear and power of evil. Those who are familiar with the course of biblical theology know how central is its emphasis on eschatology. But the word and its implications are not easily interpreted to a generation for whom the phrases of Scripture are loaded with associations derived from modern ideals. Modern ideals have been concentrated on the attainment of a secular paradise in the near or distant future or, when that has seemed a hopeless prospect, on the discovery of some city of refuge from the turmoil of the times. Eschato-

logy speaks not of these natural objects of human aspiration, but of the *eschaton*, the last thing, the God-given end of man's existence. "End," not in the chronological sense of that which will come last in time, but in the transcendent sense of that which is final in the eternal order of being. The *eschaton* is the Kingdom of God, the perfect rule of God over His redeemed and chosen people. This end we could never attain, still less secure to ourselves, by our own efforts. Even on the most optimistic calculation, it can never be achieved in this world where sin and pain and death are inveterate realities. Nevertheless, the Gospel proclaims that by the act and gift of God in Jesus Christ the *eschaton* has drawn near, and has entered into man's historical existence. Our history in time is for ever intersected by this eternal act of God which is just as much a present and powerful reality as all the forces that oppose it. These forces will continue their opposition as long as history lasts. They have been once and for all overcome, but they have not been dismissed. Our existence is still set in the core of conflict. "In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

* * * * *

Where theologians forgather, there is much discussion about the original meaning and the permanent significance of the New Testament eschatology. There is general agreement that from beginning to end, albeit with variations of emphasis and idiom, its teaching is eschatological—*i.e.*, concerned with the last things. But there is difference of opinion as to how this concern should be understood. Few theologians would now maintain that the preoccupation of the New Testament with the end of the world was merely an aberration which is to be explained and discounted as an irrelevance due to the *Zeitgeist* of late Judaism. Mr H. V. Martin, writing in the *Expository Times*,[1] discriminates three other schools of interpretation. First, there are the thoroughgoing or consistent eschatologists, of whom Schweitzer is the most famous; according to them Jesus preached that the end was going to arrive in the immediate future, and the ethic that He taught was an interim-ethic—*i.e.*, it was intended to serve only for the short interim period that would elapse before the end came.

[1] November, 1939, p. 88.

Secondly, there is the school of sublimated or transmuted eschatology; according to this, while Jesus certainly used the language of the end, he intended it to convey a new and purely spiritual meaning. Thirdly, and more recently, there has arisen a school of realized eschatology, which holds that Jesus taught and His disciples believed that the eschatological hopes of Israel were in fact realized in the coming of the Christ. The *eschaton* was no longer in the future; it had arrived.

* * * * *

Mr Martin, in the article to which we have referred, recognizes that this last standpoint "is a great advance upon the previous ones, and illuminates many of the difficult problems of the New Testament." But he adds, we think rightly, that its stress on the present realization of the Kingdom "seems to ignore the sense in which to the early Church the Kingdom of God was still awaiting its consummation." He suggests that the term "proleptic" would indicate more accurately the eschatological outlook of the Bible. "The Eschaton, the final goal of all history, the Day of Yahweh introducing the New Age of redemption, lies above and beyond history. Yet . . . it has burst in upon human history, and thus by anticipation we can experience the power and blessing of that Kingdom within this present age." The issues here involved are of much more than academic interest, although the study of them has not yet proceeded far beyond academic circles. We hope early next year to publish some articles on the subject. The preaching of the Gospel loses its force unless its eschatological reference is explicit. The peace of God that passes understanding is the peace which flows from the knowledge that in Christ God has effected the final resolution of the conflicts which condition and even constitute man's existence in history. The victory of the crucified and risen Lord is not only a spectacle for our contemplation, but a real and availing presence in the Church which is His body. It gives a new interest and a new possibility to the historical conflict.

* * * * *

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the emphasis on eschatology, which is characteristic of contemporary theology, is liable to induce an indifference to the historical conflict or a sense of hopelessness as to the possibility of

establishing in history a righteous and harmonious order among men. While the Christian ought to be free from utopian illusions, his allegiance to the Kingdom of God imposes upon him the obligation to seek and to secure the righteousness of the Kingdom in all human relations. The certainty that the historical conflict " is decided in eternity does not relieve us of the duty of working towards a concrete solution in finite time, in which the eternal decision appears."[1] While therefore we must never equate the peace of the Gospel with any temporal international project, Christians ought to be more interested and active than any other body of people in the promotion of plans for establishing a just harmony between the conflicting forces in society. If the biblical revelation shows the impossibility of finally eliminating the sources of conflict within history, its insistence on the duty of social as well as of personal righteousness leaves us no excuse for a retreat into otherworldliness.

* * * * *

There is an important article by Dr Mozley on " Eschatology and Ethics " in the current number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*. He quotes, as an illustration of the quietism which an unqualified eschatology may be taken to justify, the clever parody of the hymn " Rise up, O men of God ":

> Sit down, O men of God,
> His Kingdom He will bring
> Whenever it may please His will:
> You cannot do a thing !

That this is a caricature of the implications which theologians like Barth and Brunner draw from their theological presuppositions everyone must recognize; what is in doubt is whether they have succeeded in striking the true correlation between eschatology and ethics. Dr Mozley considers that there are signs, both in New Testament scholarship and in the interpretation of history, that " the antithesis of an ethical *or* an eschatological world-view is becoming less tenable " than was supposed when the fascination of pure eschatology fell upon a generation that was in violent reaction from the liberal optimism of much nineteenth-century theology. But the reaction has disclosed afresh the

[1] Paul Tillich, *The Interpretation of History*, p. 98.

immutable foundation of the Christian hope in this world and for this world, and so has opened up the possibility of a more adequate theological synthesis and of a more realistic "social Gospel."

* * * * *

Unfavourable allusions to "Barthianism" frequently appear in the pages of THEOLOGY, and we are glad to provide a professed disciple of the master with an opportunity of protesting against what he considers to be misrepresentation in a book that we have strongly recommended. Whether or not he has succeeded in calling attention to a blemish in Mr Demant's valuable book—and judgment on that point should be suspended till Mr Demant has replied—many English writers and speakers are undoubtedly tempted to use the term "Barthian" not only adversely, which they may be justified in doing, but carelessly. The article by Mr Jenkins will serve a salutary purpose if those who are exposed to this temptation are incited by it to make sure of their ground.

* * * * *

The Archbishop of York's article, which we published last month, plainly opened up a discussion which must be continued. We hope to follow up the forcible contribution that is made this month on behalf of the younger theologians with an article by the Dean of Winchester.

The Future of Anglican Theology

In his article on "Theology To-day" in the November issue of this journal the Archbishop of York expressed the hope that others, specially of the younger theologians, might follow his example and give their diagnosis of the present theological situation. That is the present writer's only excuse for accepting a task which might otherwise well appear as a gratuitous exhibition of bumptiousness.

No one who is in contact with the younger generation in theology is likely to question the Archbishop's assertion that there is an acute sense of divergence between older and younger theologians. Such a situation is, of course, not unique; it happens from time to time, and is only to be expected. An obvious instance, which amounted to something like a crisis and had distressing effects on many of the personal relations involved, is that of *Lux Mundi*. Two particular considerations, however, suggest that the present divergence is one of unusual significance. The first is that, whereas it is usually the old who are theologically conservative and the young who are inclined to kick over the traces of orthodoxy, to-day the reverse is the case. At the present time the older men are to a greater or a lesser degree liberals, while the younger are demanding a return to dogma. This is where the present situation so radically differs from that of *Lux Mundi*, and if disastrous confusion is to be avoided it is essential that this shall be recognized. The second consideration is that, so far as one can judge, the lack of understanding between old and young to-day would seem, as compared with that at other epochs, both abnormally great and peculiarly difficult to cope with. There is a very sufficient reason for this. The two generations received their theological formation in the pre-war and post-war periods respectively. (The war referred to is, of course, that of 1914-1918.) The Archbishop has pointed this out, but it seems worth while to underline it. For the Great War not only marked the transformation from a confident to a disillusioned world; it also deprived the community, by premature death, of a great many of the men who, by reason of their age, might have bridged the gap between those whom now we describe as the "old" and the "young." The gap is thus of a twofold nature: it is both a gap of thought (and an exceptionally wide one at that)

and a gap in personnel. It has arisen without any deliberate intention, and certainly without any ill-will. But it is undoubtedly there. The older theologians for the most part appear to the younger to be concerned, if not with a vanished world, at least with a theology that only a vanished world could find relevant, while the younger must presumably appear to the older as a set of precocious and reactionary infants with no respect for age or experience.

I have described the thought of the older theologians as "liberal," and it is important to precise the meaning of this term. It certainly need not imply deliberate unorthodoxy. The Church of England has had unorthodox liberal theologians in plenty, but we need not consider them here. Anglican Modernism is almost dead as an intellectual movement, though the doctrinal chaos which it has left in the body of the Church would be hard to exaggerate. The liberalism with which we *are* concerned is what is generally known as Liberal Catholicism, and its more or less official expression may be taken to be the volume *Essays Catholic and Critical* published in 1926, though by no means all the theologians to whom the term Liberal Catholic might be applied are represented in it. This type of liberalism never set out to be unorthodox; on the contrary, its intention was to rehabilitate orthodoxy, and such defects as it had from a traditional point of view were incidental rather than deliberate. And common gratitude compels the admission that many of the younger theologians of the present day learnt their religion from their liberal elders and, under God, owe everything to them, however much they may have reacted theologically since. The distinguishing feature of Liberal Catholicism was that it was a break with the past. Instead of discussing its problems in the light of traditional theological principles and attempting to continue the development of traditional theology, it tried to build up theology entirely *de novo* upon the basis of contemporary science and philosophy. Its primary concern—and it was a laudable one—was to retain within the Church those who had grown up in a Christian atmosphere and were temperamentally disposed to be Christians, but whose faith had been undermined by modern scientific research. In many cases its success was remarkable, but it had two grave defects. Its Catholicism was something less than the Catholicism of the Church, and the philosophical basis which it assumed was very questionable and has already become outmoded.

There is no need here to emphasize its ill-adaptedness to the present-day world; the Archbishop of York has admitted that with almost too much frankness in his article. It will be well to see what the younger theologians have to offer in its place.

Briefly, the younger movement in theology might be described as a Return to Dogma. It is concerned not so much with trying to prove by the methods of contemporary secular thought that the Christian Religion can make out a good case for itself as with taking the Faith as something revealed by God in Christ and examining how it can be applied to the problems of the present-day world, though this must not be taken to mean that it is uninterested in apologetics. And the younger theologians fall into two main sections, whose main interests are in biblical and systematic theology respectively.

The biblical section is the better known at present. It sprang, so far as Anglicanism is concerned, from the work of the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, one of the very few theologians who bridged the 1914-18 gap. Its fundamental position might be indicated by saying that it takes the Bible not primarily as an historical document which under the critical method can yield important results concerning the factual basis of Christianity, but as the inspired Word of God not only describing, but itself being part of, the irruption of the transcendent God into a fallen world. It is not for us to sit in judgment on the Bible, the Bible sits in judgment on us. Criticism has indeed its place, but the first duty of the biblical scholar is not to criticize the Bible but to interpret it. The Bible is primarily a theological document, and theology is something different from historical and literary study. As Hoskyns once remarked, if this were not so there would be every justification for the anthropologist who said to a psychologist friend outside the Divinity Schools at Cambridge, "In ten years' time we shall be in there."

The biblical revival suffers, however, from one serious drawback. However loyally Anglican its Anglican representatives may be, its affinities are with German Protestantism; it is well known how large a part was played in it by Hoskyns' translation of Barth's *Römerbrief*. And it has not yet shaken itself free from a tendency to express itself, not in terms of traditional Anglican theology, but in those of Continental Lutheranism and Calvinism. Grace appears in it rather

as annihilating than as healing and perfecting nature.[1] The Archbishop of York is rightly suspicious of its claim to be an entirely adequate substitute for the theology of which he is such a distinguished representative. For, while the liberal theology tended to lose sight of the distinction between grace and nature, the biblical school seems at times to ignore nature altogether. And the Archbishop, with his profound concern with social problems, is rightly jealous of the claims of nature. A theology of Judgment and Redemption must not be allowed to obscure the truths of Creation and Incarnation. But it is here that I would suggest we can see the importance of the other section of the younger school.

For, although its published work has hardly got beyond the stage of numerous articles in such journals as *Christendom* (and it is worth noting in passing that *Christendom* and its associated activities seem at the moment to be the main link between the pre- and the post-war mind), there is a quite large and vigorous group of younger men who conceive the return to dogma not in terms of neo-Calvinism or neo-Lutheranism but of traditional Catholic theology. It would be a complete misunderstanding to see in them only a set of Papalists or medievalists. Whether they should be described as "scholastics" is largely a matter of words. There is certainly little to be said for the common use of the terms "scholastic," "Thomist" and "medievalist" as synonymous pejoratives. (It is a surprise to many to realize that some scholastics are not Thomists at all, or to find a modern Dominican[2] using the term "scholastic" to designate post-Tridentine theologians and appealing for a return from scholasticism to Thomism!) They would indeed lay stress on the importance of the great figures in the Western tradition and in particular of the Angelic Doctor, but they would also insist that the great Anglican divines, such as Hooker, Andrewes, Taylor and Hall, wrote in terms of scholasticism and cannot be understood apart from it. (It must be noticed that the "schoolmen" whom these latter sometimes condemn are generally late and debased nominalists.) What they are concerned with is not primarily scholasticism, but dogmatic theology, and they would

[1] This note was, for example, prominent in the Rev. F. N. Davey's article on "Biblical Theology" in this journal last March. [2] Fr L. Charlier in *Essai sur le Problème Théologique* (Ramgal, Thuillies, 1938).

maintain that the great system of dogmatic theology which the Church of England inherited from the Middle Ages, which was unbroken until the arrival of Hanoverian latitudinarianism, and which reappeared in a rather attenuated and one-sided form in the Tractarians, is the proper sphere of thought in which an Anglican should move. It would appear to be capable of harmonizing whatever is of permanent value in liberalism—namely, its stress upon the rights of reason—with the *givenness* so characteristic of the biblical school. Nor are there lacking younger theologians who believe that the biblical and systematic approaches are not incompatible with but complementary to one another, and that one of the great needs of modern biblical theology is that it should be thought out in Catholic and not in Barthian terms.

But the strongest plank in the " systematic " platform is the need for a theology that shall be *complete*. It is here that liberalism so manifestly failed. For, apart from its serious intellectual weaknesses, such as its unreflective acceptance of an evolutionary theory of religious development and a Kantian metaphysic, its results are almost entirely in the field of apologetic. There are whole realms of theology of the utmost importance, such as moral, ascetic and mystical theology, and sociology, about which it has had nothing to say. It is significant that such theologians of the liberal school as have dealt with them (one thinks, for example, of the Bishop of Oxford's great work in moral theology) have perforce let their liberalism fall into the background for the occasion and argued in terms of the *theologia perennis*. Liberalism would seem to have been a temporary divergence from the main stream of Anglicanism, largely due to pressure of circumstances and by no means wholly valueless, but incomplete, lacking continuity with the past, and without solid foundation.

The upshot of this extremely contentious and doubtless over-simplified discussion would seem to be this, that a co-ordination and integration of the two main tendencies among the younger theologians—namely, the biblical and the systematic—would offer the most hopeful outlook for an Anglican theology complete, balanced and adequate. Liberalism as a philosophy, if indeed it ever really was that, would be violently rejected by most of the younger minds, but this does not mean that there was nothing good in the work of the liberal theologians or indeed that all

through the liberal period there were not representatives of the true Anglican tradition.[1] For Anglican liberalism at its best has never quite forgotten its roots in historical Catholicism; that is why Anglican biblical criticism has been at once so much saner a study than that of the German school and so exasperating a phenomenon to those who, not being in the Catholic tradition, could see in it nothing more than an attempt to run with the critical hare and follow with the Catholic hounds. If the work of the biblical revival and the permanent gains of the liberal period can be brought into the traditional structure of dogmatic theology, Anglicanism may do for the twentieth century what the Dominicans did for the thirteenth. And there should be two very important results.

First, Anglicanism would be delivered from the humiliating position which it usually occupies in " ecumenical " gatherings of having no theology of its own. It is a common experience at such meetings that, while non-Anglicans are able to present a coherent statement of the teaching of their churches on any given matter, the Anglicans present are usually reduced to inventing a theory which will include the various non-Anglican positions and which they then dignify with the title of " the Anglican view." This can hardly be justified by saying that the Anglican Communion is a bridge church.

Secondly, we may hope to achieve a real point of contact with the quite remarkable theological movements in the Roman Communion, which represent a definite attempt to get back behind the post-Tridentine presentation to the essential Catholicism of the Bible, the Fathers and the great scholastics. The Liturgical Movement of the Benedictines, the renewed understanding of the corporate unity of the human race and of the Church as the Body of Christ, which is due to such theologians as Mersch, Congar and de Lubac, the revival of biblical study after its damping down by the Biblical Commission, evident in the recent symposium *Initiation Biblique*, all these have little or no affinity with liberalism, but can find at least common ground for discussion in an Anglicanism which is true to its traditional appeal to the Bible and the Fathers, and which believes itself to be in the main stream of the Church's thought and not to be paddling about in a private backwater of its own.

[1] For example, such a figure as Dr Darwell Stone.

The Return to Dogma, then, is not to be taken as a narrow or obscurantist movement, nor as a repudiation of all that has happened in the last fifty years. It must preserve all that has emerged of permanent value from the liberal period, but it must get back into the current of both Anglican and Catholic theology (for these are in essence the same), and in doing this it will be able to speak with authority to the world which the Church is called upon to save to-day. But, if this is to take place, two tasks call for immediate initiation. One is the comparatively easy one of uniting the biblical and systematic movements in the younger school. The other, and more difficult, is the bridging of the gap which at present divides both of these from their elders. But neither should be impossible where there are charity and humility.

E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.

Mr Demant and Karl Barth

The small group of faithful followers of Karl Barth in this country have begun almost to despair of his ever being understood by the mass of English theological writers. No theologian can ever have been subject to more irrelevant criticism and few can have been so frequently damned with a faint praise which has been given for the wrong reasons. Mr Demant, it was to be hoped, would prove an exception. He has an acute and critical intelligence, he is widely read in modern theological literature, and he is a leading representative of a group in England with whom modern Reformed theologians have much in common, and with whom they are anxious to have serious discussion. When he, therefore, in his latest book, *The Religious Prospect*, falls into the popular error and presents the usual English caricature of the teaching of the so-called "Neo-Calvinist Revival," it becomes imperative that attention should be called to the fact.

Mr Demant regards the teaching of Barth and his followers as inadequate to the present religious situation because its "abstract transcendentalism" provides no religious criterion for man's judgment and action. The contradiction between God and the world disappears "except as the declaration of an entirely interior and abstract act of faith."[1] "The

[1] *The Religious Prospect*, p. 170.

identity of God the Creator and Preserver and God the Redeemer and Saviour is no more than a verbal affirmation."[1] This teaching, according to Mr Demant, claims that all life is equally under the divine "No," and therefore it is as useless as the dogma, that of Liberal Humanism, which says that all is equally under the divine "Yes." These two, indeed, are "dialectically opposed" positions which have arisen historically in opposition to each other. "A growing number of Christian Liberals and humanists," for example, "are to-day going over to a definitely anti-historical conception of the divine action, a dogma of complete severance between the redemptive and providential order, a doctrine of transcendence that relieves from judgment on secular events and an eschatological theology which has no relevance to the ordering of society."[2]

So Mr Demant represents this teaching. Practically every point he makes can be confuted out of Barth's own words. First, the act of faith which provides the link between God and man is described as merely "interior and abstract." It is difficult to know exactly what Mr Demant's loose language means to imply by this. It is probably only a particularly glaring instance of his habit of misinterpreting Barth in terms of pietistic English "Evangelicalism" which we shall have to note later. However that may be, and setting aside for the moment Barth's insistence, in common with the New Testament and classic theology, that this act of faith is nothing less than the work of the Holy Ghost, God Himself in the midst of us, how does Mr Demant reconcile his statement with the following quotation from the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, written many years ago, now?—"The fact that ethics are presented to us as a problem means that the concepts which we make use of in our conversation are, as we have so often pointed out, 'existential' concepts, and it provides us with a guarantee that, when we repeat—somewhat tediously, perhaps—the formula 'God Himself, God alone,' we do not mean by it some divine thing, or some ideal world contrasted with the visible world. We mean by the formula that unsearchable divine relationship in which we stand as men. It is in the actual tension and movement of human life, in the actual being and having and doing of men that our existential concepts and formulations emerge.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 179. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 170.

And it is precisely here that they emerge in their abstract contrast with everything human and everything of this world. There can, moreover, be no more complete misunderstanding of the abstraction of these concepts than to abstract them from the context which has given them birth, and to understand them otherwise than in relation to the concrete world in which we live. A wide reading of contemporary secular literature—especially of newspapers—is therefore recommended to anyone desirous of understanding the Epistle to the Romans."[1]

We would respectfully commend to Mr Demant the re-reading of the commentary on chapters twelve and thirteen of the Epistle, that he might ask himself whether the ethical question has ever been put more radically and more hopefully than here, and whether, also, his own proper concern to make clear the nature of our status as persons has ever been put with greater concreteness and biblical insight.[2] Or if Mr Demant desires a more systematic treatment of the way in which this act of faith relates itself to our action in this world, it has been promised us on a scale more comprehensive than anyone has attempted since Thomas Aquinas: " Ethics so called I regard as the doctrine of God's command, and do not consider it right to treat it otherwise than as an integral part of dogmatics or to produce a dogmatics which does not include it. The concept of the command of God in general should in this dogmatics be discussed at the close of the doctrine of God. The commandment of God from the viewpoint of Order will be dealt with at the close of the doctrine of Creation, from the viewpoint of Law at the close of the doctrine of Reconciliation, from the viewpoint of Promise at the close of the doctrine of Redemption."[3]

There is also, of course, the almost tediously careful and detailed account of the relation between the act of faith and action in this world in Brunner's *Divine Imperative*. As Barth once remarked to a group of earnest Anglo-Saxon critics at a Students' Conference, " You really do not need to instruct me so violently that what we are concerned about is life."[4]

Secondly, Mr Demant says that in reformed theology " the identity of God the Creator and Preserver, and God

[1] Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 425. (Trans. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, Oxford.) [2] Notably in the commentary on chapter xii, v. 6*b*-8. [3] Barth, Foreword to *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, p. xiv. (Trans. G. T. Thomson. T. and T. Clark.) [4] *God in Action*, p. 133.

the Redeemer and Saviour, is no more than a verbal affirmation." It is difficult to believe that he is serious in making this astounding statement. The sovereignty of the one God, the Lord, is, of course, the basic principle of reformed theology, but it has recently received such notable and triumphant re-statement in Barth's exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity in *The Doctrine of the Word of God* that we are bound to inquire whether Mr Demant can possibly have read that work. Surely, the whole point of that majestic argument is to vindicate the unity, the inseparable and indivisible unity, of God as Creator, Reconciler and Redeemer. It is insisted that the main purpose of the doctrine of the Trinity, the primary Christian doctrine, is to proclaim and safeguard the truth without which the Gospel perishes, that the God who redeems is the God who creates, is, in fact, the Lord, and remains so even in becoming man. It is true that, as he says, "Jesus did not so much re-proclaim the familiar World-Creator and interpret it by the likewise not unfamiliar name of Father," but He did reveal "the unfamiliar Father, His Father, and thereby, and first thereby and only thereby, explained that and what the Creator is and that He is as such our Father."[1] Further, if any weakness exists in Barth's treatment of the doctrine of God as Creator it will surely manifest itself most clearly in his handling of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Within the limits of this article we can do no more than refer Mr Demant to the unambiguous treatment of the activity of the Holy Spirit in creation to be found in the *Dogmatic*.[2]

Thirdly, Mr Demant says that this teaching maintains that all life is equally under the divine "No," and that "the world process is so uniformly and homogeneously under sin that there is no religious warrant for judging some manifestations of sinfulness better or worse than others."[3] If Mr Demant means by this ambiguous remark that Barth says that because we are all sinners our actions, and, therefore, the conditions of society in which we live, are a matter of indifference, it is quite certain that he is wrong. "It is true that a man may go to hell in a democracy and achieve salvation under a mobocracy or a dictatorship. But it is not true that a Christian can endorse, desire or seek after a mobocracy or a dictatorship as readily as a

[1] P. 449. [2] P. 540. *Cf. God in Action*, pp. 121 ff. [3] *The Religious Prospect*, p. 179.

democracy."[1] Again, Barth has recently said, "If the Church's form of life is the congregation as the communion of believers in an earthly body under a heavenly Head—One is your Master and ye are all brethren!—then it is inconceivable how, in the light of this, a form of life corresponding to this her own form could not be sought in the political area as well."[2] Mr Demant admits, in an article written in a much more careful and responsible vein in *The Nineteenth Century* (May, 1939), that in the *Church and State* pamphlet Barth finds it possible to give a somewhat "positive" treatment of the doctrine of the State, but he is compelled to assert that in so doing Barth is being inconsistent. Several other writers have expressed similar views. Now it is the case that some Germans and others, hastily identified as "Barthians" in this country, have expressed themselves in such a way as to give a certain amount of plausibility to this criticism.[3] But there is nothing in Barth which justifies this charge of inconsistency. He himself is astonished to find that his pamphlet should cause any surprise, and most of his followers share his astonishment. For our part, it was not any "wave of apocalyptic pessimism" which drove us to Barth's teaching, but a discovery that here at last was a theologian who did justice to biblical revelation and, because he did that, did justice to the conditions of life on this earth as well, who, in fact, provided a sound ethical criterion, without the externality of Catholic ethics on the one hand and without the irrelevance of Liberal pacifist ethics on the other. The germ of the doctrine of the State so firmly laid down in the *Church and State* pamphlet is already present in his commentary on Romans xiii, 1 and 2. Surely we can give Barth credit for knowing his own mind, and when he insists that he has not modified his position it is for those who say he has to ask themselves whether they have understood him aright. The famous "Czech Soldier" he himself has recently dealt with faithfully in *The Church and the Political Problem To-day*, and it is unnecessary for us to say any more about him.

To turn now to Mr Demant's favourite idea, that the Reformed and the Liberal humanist positions are "dia-

[1] *Church and State*, p. 90. (Trans. R. G. Howe. S.C.M.) [2] *The Church and the Political Problem To-day*, p. 75. (Hodder and Stoughton.)
[3] *Cf.* Günther Dehn, *Man and Revelation*, ch. 6. (Hodder and Stoughton.)

lectically opposed," and that the inadequacy of the one necessarily gives rise to the appearance of the other. Setting aside his dubious appeals to history, this criticism reveals that he has missed one of the most important features of Barth's contribution to theology. Barth claims that he has rediscovered the true theological method, that of attempting to let the Word of God speak for itself. Dogmatics, as he conceives it, is the Church's attempt to answer the vital question, " How do we know that the Word we proclaim is in truth the Word of God?" And the only way in which she can answer it is, not by checking it by a preconceived philosophy or " the religious needs of the time," but by the Word of God Itself, as It is, primarily, in the prophetic and apostolic witness to Christ in the Scriptures, and, secondarily and derivatively, in the experience of the Church. The Word of God, Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit, is, therefore, the only criterion in Dogmatics—an argument in a circle only to those who deny the reality of the revelation itself. It is impossible, therefore, to stand outside and criticize the findings of Dogmatics from a detached " observer-attitude," a superior point of vantage to the one given in faith. This Dogmatics insists that it must not be thought of as a " position " in the ordinary sense, as a " school of thought," not because every point of view inevitably thinks itself the right one, but because of the nature of its datum, the Word of God, which always stands over against it in judgment and promise. Its method is one of the most radical self-criticism, a ceaseless examination of itself lest it become a " school of thought," an assured position, which no longer need bear the scrutiny of the Word of God. In fact, an analogy may be drawn between Dogmatics within the church and repentance in the life of the individual believer. The individual believer's life, lived " between the times " of Creation and Redemption, consists in a constant tension between faith and unbelief, and he has ceaselessly to be making the movement of repentance, of turning from unbelief to faith if he is to live the Christian life. In the same way the Church also does not possess the Word of God once for all as an assured possession ; she is always in process of becoming the body of Christ, and therefore she must constantly be making the movement of re-formation, of bringing herself ever anew into subjection to the Word of God, if she is to continue to be the Church. In this, Dogmatics is her indispensable

servant. This tension in the Church's life, and therefore this critical function of Dogmatics, can be resolved, not from the higher point of vantage provided by Catholic theology, but only by God Himself. This is a *theologia viatoris*, not a *theologia gloriæ*. And because its method is by recognizing and taking account of the fact that we have this treasure in earthen vessels—hence its truly dialectical character—to let the Word of God speak for Itself, it claims that it alone can be the theology of a true Catholicism. For the Word of God, precisely because It is the Word of God the Creator, addresses our essential humanity, and not some aspects of it only. Roman Catholicism, this theology maintains, by refusing to allow the searchlight of the Word of God to examine the form of the Church itself, and by conceiving of the Church as a direct expression of the Word, traps the Word in what is only a relative, historical interpretation of It, and thus becomes a sect. To speak of a Reformed theology or a Reformed type of spirituality which needs to be supplemented by other types of theology and spirituality and gathered together in the synthetic unity of Catholicism, after the manner of Przywara's " Polarity," is to misunderstand what Barth asserts. Mr Demant cannot evaluate the theology expounded by Barth from the viewpoint of a Catholic philosophy of being without at least recognizing the fact that Barth, with full self-consciousness, has delivered a terrific onslaught on the very foundations of that philosophy. He is, after all, a great systematic theologian. Barth is not, as seems to be the general impression in this country, an unusually eloquent and unsentimental Keswick Convention speaker. It will not do to dismiss him by neat theories about " enantriodromia," any more than it will do to say, in the classic words of a recent American writer,[1] that we should read the Barthians for devotional purposes, but take our theology from Thomas Aquinas. His teaching is a unity and, at least as regards his theological method, it must be accepted wholeheartedly or totally rejected.

There is a point at issue between Reformed theology and Catholic theology, and a point of vital importance. When Mr Demant says, with admirable clarity—" We need a dogma that enables us to detect God's hand even in that which contradicts ' our ' good in the actual

[1] Dr W. M. Horton, *Contemporary Continental Theology*.

world. Such a dogma . . . posits a tug of the eternal God upon the world order which is alienated from Him, and, therefore, from its true being; God's hand is thus seen in the dialectical contradiction of the world order itself. But this link-in-contradiction between God and the world cannot be discerned by man except through the knowledge he brings to his existence in the world order *from* another source. That source lies in his knowledge of God transcendent given in Salvation "[1]—a Reformed theologian could, in substance, agree with him. But it is precisely that which he would maintain that Mr Demant's preoccupation with natural law refuses to take seriously. The real controversy is not as to whether there is an ethical criterion, but as to the exact nature of the ethical criterion. Ultimately, it is a debate concerning the nature of the operation of the Holy Spirit, and therefore concerning the nature of God Himself. As Barth himself puts it, the issue is between those who regard the Spirit as a datum and those who regard It as a dandum,[2] between those who maintain that the analogy between Creator and creature—the existence of which no one denies—is one of being and those who say it is one of faith. He would deny that any of the external and internal " urges " of our existence as creatures can be taken by us to be, in themselves and as they are, already the Creator's Word to us. (Hence there can be no natural theology and no natural law in the traditional sense.) And he would also deny that even the scriptural announcement of revelation can be taken as a datum, a sum of ready-made views existing at our disposal, whereby the above " urges " are turned into commands of God. (Hence, there can be no " Christian Polity " of the type desiderated either by Mr Demant or by some forms of traditional Calvinism.) Such possibilities presuppose a " tranquil and assured continuity " between Creator and creature which revelation denies. The Scriptures must ever be *becoming* the Word of God to us and the constraints of existence must ever be *acquiring* the character of God's commands through God's Word to us. Theological ethics, therefore, should not try to say directly what God's command is. They cannot appeal to the truths supposed to lie in nature, nor even to the texts of the Bible

[1] *The Religious Prospect*, p. 175.

[2] *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, pp. 11-27. (Frederick Muller.)

as such. Their purpose is to treat the Word of God as in truth *God's* Word and " to point out the way whereby the relative necessities of our existence can *become* the Word of God's revelation to us." That is to say, the Holy Spirit must be allowed its freedom in revelation, God must be allowed His lordship that He may be glorified and we find our true life. Because the Christian life exists in this world as a tension between faith and unbelief, Christian ethics can never take themselves or the form of society which they create for granted, any more than the Church can take itself for granted. Only when we thus recognize fully that we walk by faith and not by sight can we see the good which contradicts " our " good in the world, when we follow, not our own selfish impulses and ideals, but the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night, leading us to the Promised Land where our true home is. This teaching fits into the setting of eschatology in which the Bible always places its ethical demands as the Catholicism of the Vatican and *Quadragesimo Anno* so conspicuously does not. It insists " that we are able to hear only as we *pray*, ' I am a sojourner on earth, hide not Thy commandments from me.' "[1]

It is along these lines that the debate between Reformed and Catholic theology must proceed. We cannot do more than indicate them at present, for this is the issue which must occupy theological discussion for a long time to come. The purpose of this essay is a much simpler one. It is merely to point out that Mr Demant, at least as *The Religious Prospect* represents his views, has not done justice to the Reformed position and has, therefore, seriously hindered the usefulness of that discussion. We rejoice that at last some English Catholics are showing signs of being prepared to discuss theological issues theologically and not in terms of church history or liturgiology. It is our belief that when the issues are clearly seen, ultimate agreement between us will not be impossible. But no progress is going to be made so long as responsible theologians put up men of straw of their own creation and when, not unnaturally, they find no difficulty in knocking them down, rub their hands gleefully and imagine they have disposed of the " Barthian challenge."

DANIEL JENKINS.

[1] Psalm cxix, 19. Barth, *Holy Ghost and the Christian Life*, p. 27.

Divites Dimisit

(*For Michal, in memory of the darkness*, 1914-17.)

The line held along the Rhine and the Danube;
the consuls and kings defended the fords and the roads;
but the chosen champions of the Empire forgot the Empire.

Pale was the tale of peace in London and Lutetia,
bloody the Noel-song; the towns of Logres
felt the sliding planes of the raiders' sails,
and Gaul all the push of the Northern woods,
natural growths, moods infinitely multiplied
across bleak plains, in rains and snows,
strength unarticulated in morals, and race
sullenly by marshes separated from race,
virtue monopolized and grace prized in schism.
Heathendom grew within the Empire; few
guessed how men were shaped in body or mind;
they pined thinking of the grand attack; their loves
escaped back to the old necromantic gnosis
of separation, were it but from one soul.
Frantic with fear of losing themselves in others
they separated one soul for denunciation—
the devil, or the khan of the Huns, or the wizard of Asia.
Losing the City, they made substitutes for the City—
mutes or rhetoricians instead of the sacred poets,
braggadocio or burlesque for fair hope.

Early on a feast of Christmas the young Pope
Deodatus knelt in Lateran, slender, strong,
Egyptian-born, white-haired, seeming as old
as Merlin, in his trance of prayer the twin of Merlin,
but for the seer's black hair bleached,
as if Merlin, time's metre, were smitten by sacred loss.
Before and above him a glass reliquary held
the Holy Blood, crimson; he waited to pass
to sing the Eucharist; meanwhile the Pope prayed.
Sweet his voice sounded in the late Latin
founded on Virgil, colloquial, capable of rhyme,
fastening in a new time Lupercal and Lateran,
and hastening by measure the flood of the soul in the blood.
The young Pontiff's meditations set to *Magnificat*,
to the total Birth intending the total Death,
to the Love that lost Itself, nor only an image
nor only all the images, but wholly Itself.
The Pope prayed: " But each loss of each image
is single and full, a thing unrequited,

plighted in presence to no recompense, no
purchase of paradise; eyes see no future;
when the Son of Man comes, he brings no faith in a future.
Send not, send not, the rich empty away."

Good or bad or both, the lords of Logres
loosening their swords before the last battle,
each remembered his single particular loss.
The king felt: " Now the dynasty fails. . . ."
Bors felt: " Farms and manors are burned;
the corn lost, the poor returned to starvation. . . ."
Lancelot, standing by the landing of his men at Dover,
felt: " If we win, after this, her kiss is the king's. . . ."
Only Taliessin, in the west with the king, smiled
to think how the household had founded a new Order,
known by no name, least their own,
grounded in the law of the Empire, the acts of the Throne,
the pacts of the themes, from rose-lordly Caucasia
to the sentences sealing the soul through the whole of Logres
in the mouth of London-in-Logres; their salutation
was everywhere the promulgation of the Co-inherence.

The Pope prayed to the blessed Blood in Lateran:
" Rich in sorrow, rich in heart's heaviness,
blessed are we, bearing soul's wealth now,
and cannot any how part with that wealth, laden
with loss, and the loss always an affirmation,
double affirmation—image and the opposite of image
(which its wit, as thine, O Blessed, courteously carries,
but thine thyself only and the lack of thyself):
send not, send not, these rich empty away."

Well had Mordred spelled his lessons from the king,
from his father, King Arthur, whose mind designed the Grail
to decorate Logres with life and end strife
in the hall of Camelot, all aggression put down,
and the Crown establishing plausible justice in Logres.
The prince hungered; he waited to-morrow and to-morrow
till the sorrow of the waiting, satiating his blood,
drove him to change the double wealth of loss
for the single having; his craving refused itself.
He joined with the pirates against and to gain the Crown,
he leagued with foes of the Empire against the Empire,
setting his image up against the Empire,
begetting on the succubus of his longing, in the world of pirates,
the falsity of all images and their incoherence.

The Pope prayed: " Where is difference between us ?
what does the line along the rivers define ?

Causes and catapults they have and we have,
and the death of a brave beauty is mutual everywhere.
If there be difference, it must be in thy sense
that we declare—O Blessed, pardon affirmation !—
and they deny—O Blessed, pardon negation !—
that we derive from them and they from us,
and alive are they in us and we in them.
We know how we have sinned; we know not how they.
Intend for us the double wealth of repentance:
send not, send not, the rich empty away."

Over the Rhine, over the Vistula and Danube,
pushed the grand tribes; the land shook
as band after band stamped on the Roman towns
whose burning lamped their path; their wrath grew
with victory; thereon they knew no returning.
They followed the corpses to battle, corpses called
out of earth by the wizards, vivified, automatized
precursors of the hordes in a necromancy of justice;
the mechanized bodies stalked over the fords;
consuls and kings felt the cold coming
of the dead whom the lords of empire had once slain,
the uneyed images of old blockade and barricade,
children starved in sieges, prostituted women,
men made slaves or crucified—all from graves
drawn by maleficent spells, but too-veritable ghosts,
before those hosts moving in a terrible twilight.

The Pope passed to sing the Christmas Eucharist;
he invoked peace on the souls of all the dead,
yoked fast to him and he to them,
co-inherent all in Adam and all in Christ.
The magical march of the dead by Rhine and Danube,
and the tread of the necromancers who affirm only
vengeance and value of victory, he lonely
received; he sheaved there the corn of his prayer.
The wizards in the Empire and beyond the Empire
walked and talked silently in the spiritual place.
The gnosis of separation in the Pope's soul
became a promulgation of sacred union;
his their sin and theirs his
in the mystical kiss of sin and pardon in Christ.
He offered his soul's substance to the living corpses,
his richness of repentance, his weal in their woe.
Quick the crowd, the thick souls of the dead,
hovered in the Pope's substance over the engrailed
Blood of the Eucharist, blood of the total loss,
the unimaged loss, the offering of Itself to Itself.

The easement of exchange led into Christ's appeasement;
reconciled, their spirits became tongues of the Holy Ghost
under the heartbreaking manual acts of the Pope.
Before the host on the rivers the corpses dropped,
sank, and were swept away; within the Empire
the false champions of Empire felt the Empire
revive in a live song of the sacred City.

Kneeling after the Eucharist the Pope said,
for the riches of loss, *Magnificat*; prostrate, he prayed:
" Send not, send not, the rich empty away."

CHARLES WILLIAMS.

Moral Theology

DESPITE a century of the Oxford Movement, the very name of moral theology still sounds foreign in the English tongue. It came from outside, and most of our people are puzzled to know just what it refers to, and how far it fits in with ethics, Christian ethics, and theology. To make an exact demarcation of moral theology from Christian ethics seems always rather artificial, though there is a considerable difference in the connotation of the two terms. It is practically useful to have it understood that Christian ethics treats of more general principles, while moral theology moves nearer to case-work, at least toward application of principles to many kinds of actual cases. But the immense difference between the whole atmosphere of moral theology as it concretely comes before us and that of Christian ethics as we have been brought up on it is far wider than the difference between general principles and special cases. They are different expressions of the Church's conscience, they have grown up in different habitats, and their ways are very unlike.

In so far as we have a moral theology in concrete fact, not in name only, an interesting new name superimposed upon the regular old stuff, we owe a great deal of it to the development given to the study of morality in the Roman Communion. And its relevance to our needs cannot be determined without knowledge of it as it is, in its home, without an inspection of the character and condition of what generally goes by the name of moral theology, the actual institution that is represented by the great Jesuit

systematizers, such as Dr Slater for instance, rather than by any of our Anglican writings under that title.

The character of the Latin moral theology depends on the Latin moral philosophy. The very fact that it recognizes such dependence is significant, and marks a difference from a good deal of Christian ethics, which seems to go on a basis of autonomous biblicism, without regard to questions of moral philosophy at all. Moral theology acknowledges the biblical revelation, but sees it on a background of more general revelation, which can be considered philosophically.

The philosophical basis is, as everybody knows, Aristotelian. That is, it is more directly Aristotelian than most ethical theories, though Aristotle is in them all. And that means a kind of higher naturalism, that sets great store by the functions, energies, appetitions, natural to the human species, as naturally teleological throughout, as tending to certain ends, values, and so finds a primary criterion of good action in the objects of the agent's natural seeking, and has a wholesome respect for the appetitions themselves, the desires, likings, urges, pleasures, that mark the relation of the agent to the objects sought. This slap-dash statement may serve to place the Latin moral philosophy in the great conflict that has always gone on in ethics, both practical and theoretical, the conflict between the natural and the corrective.

As in all theory there is fundamental conflict between those who say that the truth is rather like its appearances, and those of the *via negativa*, who say that the truth is unlike appearances, so in ethical theory there has been a steady succession of those who affirm that the real good is like the apparent good, the truly desirable like the actually desired, that what we ought to seek must be in close relation to what we spontaneously do seek, etc. And all along there has been a steady negation of all this, a steady warning that in order to find the true good we must not trust appearances, or the welcome we feel inclined to give to the appearance of good, that morality is over against desire and pleasure, distrustful of them, corrective of them, often trying to mortify them. One cannot help thinking of Stoicism, Rigorism, Kantian purism, Puritanism, as on this side.

As between the affirmative naturalism and the corrective protest-morality, intermediate positions are the only reasonable ones (for even untrammelled nature naturally corrects

itself); but there is great difference of emphasis. In present-day practical movements for human improvement, sociological, psychological, pedagogical, there is no mistaking the trend from the corrective to the affirmative-natural. And in this respect the Latin moral philosophy is congenial with the modern practice. Most of us, coming upon it from outside, are surprised to find so much well-being, "eudæmony," in it, so much recognition of happiness and of utility. Hedonism and Utilitarianism are disowned and disproved, but a great deal of truth is acknowledged to be in them.

Now in our Church there is need for consideration of the question whether we are to have a moral philosophy at all or are to keep our Christian ethics and make our moral theology without any such basis, as derived simply from the Bible; and if the former, what philosophy we are to have.

Most of us, encountering the Latin moral theology, experience much more hostility to it as it stands than we do to the Latin moral philosophy. What is it that we have against it, other than its Roman *imprimatur*?

Moral theology needs an apologetic in these days. The Latins have not furnished one: they have not adequately explained its fundamental meaning, or defended its present shape. And our clergy have often taken it up with no other conception of its function than as a guide in hearing confessions, or once in a blue moon answering some very subtle question of conscience. One hopes that by the time moral theology is a well-recognized Anglican institution we shall have a much better idea why there should be any moral theology.

As it is now, it has far too much law in it for our use, and increasingly so. Where St Thomas classifies according to virtues rather than commandments, a modern Dominican will do the same, on the surface; but you have hardly got into the virtue of faith at all before you find a "precept of faith," prescribed acts of faith for certain occasions, violation of the precept of faith if you take part in a non-Christian religious service, and so on. The latest moral theology will be the best because it is up-to-date on the Canon Law. And even our own theologians, treating of moral theology, sometimes take over the legal method with the rest of it, and see what can be made of pronouncements of Lambeth Conferences as if they were our Canon Law.

By way of defect, present moral theology has too little

cognizance of sociology and psychology. It is truly social ethics in that it constantly treats of justice and charity among men, as neighbours, but it is practically a blank on the duties of social groups themselves, either toward their members or toward other groups. And in psychology, moral theology is far from being abreast even with the psychology-and-morals books that have long been with us. It is of great importance, surely, in deciding what should be done, to know as accurately as possible what can be done, and how easily, and with what good or bad effects. To incorporate—to keep on incorporating—modern psychology into systematic moral theology would be a tremendous task, and this difficulty probably more than any other has kept back the production of a full-sized Anglican moral theology. The work is being done in sections—the moral theology of medical homicide, or of contraception, or of penance, for instance; some day the sections will get into the system, or else there will be no more system.

But moral theology does at least get down to cases. It uses cases, Sempronius, Julia, etc., as examples of the principles set forth, merely to make them clear. Chosen to illustrate one principle, a case will naturally be a simple, clean-cut, one-principle case, too often like a biological specimen on a prepared slide. To start with cases of perplexity and try to find the relevant principles is quite different: then you turn from the moral theology system to a book on cases of conscience. In these you find the same over-emphasis on laws and under-emphasis on social and psychological conditions as in the moral theology books. Our treatment of cases, if there is to be anything left of it at all, if we are not to surrender it altogether to others, needs to take into account the methods employed in what is called " case-work " by the social workers, and, without stumbling into psychiatry without knowledge, our treatment of cases must at least have an awareness of the kind of questions elementary psychology knows how to ask, the mental conditions that any intelligent person can discern if he knows the elements of psychology. Social and psychological case-workers often confess the need of something authoritative to appeal to, something that religion has, especially church-religion. We are glad to think we have some such authority; but without the knowledge, the authority can only work wreckage. Without some knowledge of social and psychological conditions, to proceed

authoritatively on the basis simply of the principles given in a moral theology textbook is one of the most devastating abuses of legalism.

Many hostile observers of moral theology have thought they saw in it hardly more than an ingenious system for evading duty by some hair-splitting legalistic distinctions. Precepts are given quite strictly, as if obedience were really expected, instead of idealistic exhortations that need be met only by an uplift of the heart; and when precepts are so given, quite naturally some limitation of their applicability is given too. Where the precept does not apply, there is permission to do as one pleases, without sin. As compared with other forms of ethical literature, moral theology rather abounds in permissions, and so seems lax. But I think if one seriously reads through a moral theology textbook one will conclude that it enjoins a more severe moral direction of life than most of us have ever been willing to submit to. It may command the wrong things, but on the whole it certainly does not permit too lightsome an evasion of duty.

There are certain matters of principle, on which we might find ourselves distrustful of the Latin moral theology in its present condition. For instance, as part of the Aristotelian inheritance, it considers every activity as teleological, as naturally (universally and divinely) directed to some end. To prevent the activity from achieving its proper end is to frustrate a divinely ordered good, and so is intrinsically evil, essentially against moral reason, wrong in itself, even without regard to consequences. Now this whole contention would be true if there really were but one single end for every action. (The mind leaps at once to the birth-control question; but the principle of frustration of function has a far wider application: What is speech for? What is the end of a good dinner? etc.) The books do not quite definitely teach the doctrine of the single end; but as a whole they are under its influence. We can hardly regard it as other than a major fallacy; and the moral theology that is to be relevant to our situation must clearly avoid it.

Another matter of principle in which the prevalent moral theology is in a doubtful position is the matter of ends and means, and double (or multiple) effect. Moral theology is so fiercely uncompromising against the idea that the end may justify the means that it gives no coherent discriminating statement of the principle that an end may often be

worth what it costs in trouble, expense, etc.—many times a day we act on the basis that the end does justify the means—while there are some things (what things?) that may never be done, even for the best ends, because they are too intrinsically bad to be justifiable by anything, or perhaps must never be regarded as the *best* means to the end—the end does not quite justify any but the best means possible.

And in regard to plural effect, surely if one knows that one or more bad effects will follow, a step or two further on, along with the good effect intended, one is just as responsible for these effects as for the good thing "directly" done. In our days we know much more certainly than in ancient times what some of the results of our acts will be, and are more responsible, accordingly, even for what we indirectly do.

If in some such fundamental principles (others might have been added) there is likelihood of disagreement, perhaps protest, and if in the Latin moral theology, furthermore, many questions are decided on the basis of the Canon Law or responses of the Congregations, we can certainly not count on this body of doctrine being adopted by our Church as a handbook of ready answers to all questions of right and wrong. It is abstractly possible that the Anglican Communion might make a code of its own that could be so used; but that we know will never be. Can we use moral theology at all, then?

We can certainly use it as one of the chief ways in which the conscience of the Church expresses itself (as was well explained in Mr Farrer's article in the May number of THEOLOGY). For us it has not legal authority, but it has the authority of the considered judgment of many experts in Christian morals; the general agreement of moral theologians has very solid authority. And the agreement is not so much an agreement on just what should be done on every occasion, but rather agreement on the principles of valuation that govern the decision in many kinds of moral situation.

For moral theology shows (reluctantly, no doubt) that conflicting principles may often be applicable to a case, and that it is a fallacy to suppose that each case falls under a single law; but it shows also that the conflicting principles may well be used as instruments with which to handle the case—tools for analysis of the situation, as Dewey says. Without such reminders as moral theology gives, we often assume that the case is simply a case of one kind of thing—

the fallacy of the single classification. And we have found moral theology justifying its existence over and over again by reminding us of other principles that bear on the case, other than the obvious one.

Cases where the question is of saving one's veracity or saving a life, of advising a man to confess to the offended party and so lose his job or his home or his wife's trust in him, of gambling as a fair and just contract but a pernicious practice—cases of such kinds call not for snap-judgments, or for looking up the answer in the book, but for consideration of all the really relevant principles, and then a deliberate decision, probably not so much by way of having principles arranged in a graded hierarchy (Dr Kirk has shown how futile that is) as by seeing which principle is most relevant to the case, has the biggest stake in the case.

Sermons are often enough moralistic; they might be better if they were more moral-theological, more the homiletical version of the ordered statement of moral principle and its ordinary applications that we could get from a deliberate study of moral theology. Moral theology must outgrow the confessional box and flourish also in the pulpit, in the instructions and discussions of young people's societies, in the criticism we give to influential literary gospels outside the Church, and in the response we make to any sort of appeal for our moral support.

Moral theology is at its best, not when it rigidly sets down rules that the Christian must obey if he is not to be guilty of grave sin, but when it points on beyond itself to perfection, to acceptance of opportunities of doing one's very best, doing what could not be commanded of all but what only a few, perhaps only one, could do. This expression of the conscience of the Church may well show that conscientiousness is not final in Christian morals, but sanctity is.

M. B. Stewart.

The Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne

On a September day some few years ago, as I sat on a chair beneath the trees in the Jardins du Luxembourg, I idly watched the antics of a group of children as they played at soldiers by the fountains. They marched, wheeled and skirmished, and as they played they sang, and I was aware

that the words were the words of the " International." Perhaps nothing impressed me more, with all its implications of a steady process of dechristianization, than this incident. I had attended " monster " meetings where the Faith, if ever referred to, was considered a withered limb on the body of humanity, but I had never realized personally the extent to which a wedge was being driven between the Church and the people till that moment. The question instantly posed itself—" What efforts are being made to stem this tide of secularism; is there no league of Christian militants in France ?" I searched, and found—the Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne.

Some years previously this same problem had confronted a humble Belgian priest and he had found the solution. He saw, with a painful clarity of vision, that the masses of working men and women had become separated from the Church. Their surroundings in factory and office, the frequency of divorce, the thorough propaganda of Communist organizations, had cut them off from their inheritance, so that their very thought and lives were conditioned by secular factors alone. Religion appeared irrelevant to the business of living. At best it meant attendance at Mass on Sundays and seemed to have no impact on everyday affairs. Jules Romains' poem " L'Église " is terrible in its trenchancy:

. . . " Mon Dieu,
Faîtes que les clients viennent dans ma boutique !
* * * * *
Que mon fils n'échoue pas à l'examen, mon Dieu !"[1]

Once the greatest force in a town, the church has yielded to the factory, which now dominates all. If this sordid snivelling is religion, then it is high time men grew out of it !

Painting, literature and all art were invaded by the secular, and the fact that a few artists had turned again to look on Calvary meant little. The tortured painting of Rouault or the novels of Mauriac may mean that certain intellectuals are endeavouring to re-establish spiritual values, but the masses are outside this atmosphere of " movements," of reviews and of books. They could be moved only by persons, by action and example. " On ne réforme un milieu social

[1] Jules Romains, *La Vie Unanime*, p. 79 (Ed. Gallimard).

que si on en est." The proletariat can only be won back to the Church from within. Evangelization by militants must be the clue to the enigma.

Thus was born the J.O.C. at a working-class death-bed where Father Cardijn, a young Brussels curate, attended to his father in his last hours. There he swore an oath to himself—" se donner entièrement, de se tuer pour sauver la classe ouvrière." How then has his plan worked out ?

Before turning to discuss the organization, aims and achievements of the movement, let us glance at the geographical and numerical progress of Cardijn's idea. Jocism has as its final end the conquest of the entire working class, the whole world, for Christ and His Church. In fifteen years of existence its gains have been phenomenal. Starting with a few study circles in Belgium in 1924, it speedily fired the imagination of those who came within the orbit of its influence, so that in Flanders and in the Walloon districts there are over 100,000 members to-day. Two years later, on a June evening in 1926, four young workers at Clichy discovered the journal of the movement, *La Jeunesse Ouvrière*, and they convened a meeting with a view to founding a section in the neighbourhood. Seventy workers attended, and the present figures show that in France almost 100,000 workers, men and women, belong to the J.O.C. In like manner, it has spread to England, Ireland, Switzerland, Portugal, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Algiers, Tunis, Morocco, Indochina, Canada and British Columbia. In all of these countries the groups plan to expand their work to neighbouring lands. One catches a glimpse of a veritable *civitas Dei*, a Christian International. Aware of the need of solidarity, of unanimity of purpose and practice, the J.O.C. is uncompromising in its presentation of the Christian claims, nor does it minimize the persecutions and discomforts its adherents are bound to incur. It stands firm, a body of young and conquering Christians in a social order grown dizzy from the propaganda of totalitarianism and the insidious enticements of the new hedonism. It endeavours to recall the worker from subscribing to a scheme of things where a man's attitude to work, to amusements, to love, to the family, are grounded on the basic assumption that death closes the account, and that the idea of God has long been relegated to the lumber-room of human consciousness. The J.O.C. opposes with

all its resources those whom the late Pope condemned as working "to destroy, by every means in their power, Christian civilization . . . and to efface its memory from the minds of men." It must resist "the atomism of individualism, and the crushing collectivity of secular totalitarianism."[1] The doctrinal legacies of liberalism are powerless to save. Only the application of the words that are spirit and truth can accomplish so great an undertaking.

The secret of the success hitherto enjoyed by the movement would appear to reside in two factors. First, Jocism has a comprehensive program. It aims at the re-formation of the young worker[2] by education in religion, morals, sex, hygiene and fellowship. *Κοινωνία* is of its essence. Through him, as well as through its federations and vigilance committees, it works upon his environment, raising its tone and abolishing abuses.[3] Secondly, Jocism has ever insisted on the immense potentialities latent in the working class for bringing about that salvation which is as material as it is spiritual. Since the Incarnation has placed all the material order on a higher plane, Jocism desires that manual labour and work of every nature should receive its due recognition as part and parcel of the Divine plan for salvation. The daily round at office or fitting-room is not a neutral area. It is an integral part of that process of spiritual development, and is imbued with sacramental significance because of the stupendous fact that Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of the Lord.

With regard to the first of these factors, the practicality of the J.O.C. is astounding. Everything is catered for. But there is nothing of sub-Christian "businesslikeness" about it. Its practicality is based on the living, intimate and lasting contact between Christ the Worker and the working man and woman. It is not the objectionable practicality which forms committees first, and later bethinks itself of prayer. The movement is profoundly evangelical in the stress it lays on personal religion as the foundation of a redeemed social order.

About many movements of a similar nature there is an aura of bookishness—medievalists endeavouring to resurrect

[1] W. G. Peck, *The Catholic Faith and the Social Order*, p. 31. [2] *La J.O.C., Son Action*, p. 15. [3] Mention is made later of its various mutual aid services, financial and otherwise.

the guild system in a society organically unsuited to it. The J.O.C. is typical of the Faith in that it bears no date-stamp.

Foremost and basic, then, is religious instruction. The working class must be led to realize the Divine plan for humanity, and its own destiny, which is eternal, before it can accomplish its destiny in things temporal. Ways of thinking must be reorientated. Lives must be changed. For Jocism, with its passionate desire for social justice, is not a mere return to the humanitarian principles of the Gospel, it is the return to the entire Gospel. It is the " youth of the Church renewed."[1]

Religion is no longer an *entremets* for the leisured, it is the force which animates and sustains all the day long.

" Elle tend surtout à incarner le Christianisme dans la vie quotidienne du jeune travailleur, pour qu'il soit la source profonde de toutes ses activités."

Next, Jocism strives on behalf of the cultural formation of the worker. The crying need of the proletariat is leisure for intellectual development. It is the worker's right that he should have the means and the opportunity to interest himself in questions of social import, in the sciences, in art and in literature.

The treasures of picture galleries, of museums and of the bookstall, have been withheld from him by lack of leisure and by the fact that he is, very often, incapable of appreciation. These two obstacles the J.O.C. seeks to remove. It proclaims immoral the efforts of industrialism to exclude the artisan, by dint of long hours and heavy labour, from the realm of intellectual and æsthetic interests. It has required commissions, comprising representatives of the movement in their personnels, to be set up with a view to ensuring that the younger workers are not driven so that their health is impaired. It has demanded that the law concerning night-shifts be strictly adhered to in the case of young people under eighteen and similarly with respect to the weekly rest. It requests a more careful inspection of work, and paid holidays, and, perhaps most important of all, it demands that all pupils of school-leaving age should be examined as to their *choice* of profession, thereby endeavouring to eliminate the soul-destroying effects of uncongenial labour. Much of this program is already

[1] Rouzet, *Jocisme Mondial*, p. 12.

realized. Furthermore, in its *cercles* and federations the movement works to develop in its members taste and appreciation, sound judgment and intellectual curiosity about vital questions.

As with spiritual and intellectual, so the J.O.C. deals with moral education. The fatalism which miserable working and living conditions cultivate has to be eradicated, and in its place the worker must be given a sense of his dignity both as a Christian and as a labourer. The method of the J.O.C. is to inculcate the principles of friendship, self-sacrifice and sincerity and to keep them alive and active by a continual demand on the courage, energy and devotion of its members. In a word the movement " gives them the opportunity to act morally."[1] Moreover, every effort is made to familiarize the young worker with the Christian concept of marriage[2] and of the relationships between the sexes. To the children and to those about to begin work, the J.O.C. gives instruction as to the choice of a trade, the imperative need of a sound period of apprenticeship, and much valuable advice on the subject of modern industry and the rôle of the worker.

Physical instruction and personal hygiene form an important part of the program.

Jocism is the revolution of the Gospel. It, and not class-warfare, is " la lutte finale." It is the working class, led and taught by its own people. The World Jubilee Conference was an unprecedented success. Even the Soviet Press was forced to take notice of it. Its founder has, nevertheless, no bouquets to throw. He desires every worker for the service of our Lord. Till then there can be no congratulations.

Before turning to consider how the J.O.C. achieves its results and what is its attitude to dogma, three points need underlining. First, the J.O.C. has the Pope's explicit approval. It is an integral part of Catholic Action. " We cite," wrote the late Pope Pius, " this movement as an example to all Catholic Action."[3] Second, the movement is based on personal religion. It is a life lived. M. Cardijn briefly defines: " Le mouvement c'est presque l'Évangile." It is the faith that acts by force of prayer. It has no use

[1] *La J.O.C., Son Action*, p. 17 *f.* [2] See M. Cardijn's own brochure, *L'Idéal Chrétien du Mariage* (Ed. Jocistes). [3] August 8, 1933.

for a dead-end quietism. Escapists will find there no hiding-place. Third, Jocism is a mass movement[1] of militants—" le levain dans la pâte, l'élite dans la masse." Its leaders know well that if Christianity is to fulfil its mission Christians must fight for the Faith, and fight together. The lives of certain of the militants[2] reveal that Jocism stands for strength through holiness and self-sacrifice. " It is terrifying," wrote their founder, " what they will dare for holiness' sake."

Jocism has something of the indomitable spirit of St Paul. It looks to the strong Christ who refused the anodyne.

As its program is complete, so is its organization, which aids in conveying to the member or observer the impression of a mass movement. Plenitude of organizations assists in replacing fatalism and apathy by courage and action. For behind this complex yet smoothly running system there lies " la pédagogie active." " Voir et Agir " is one of the slogans of the movement, and by one branch of its organization the J.O.C. strives to build up in the worker a sane and clear judgment that he may the better take part in the active side of that organization.

Study circles, discussion groups, journals and lectures fit him for his active apostolate among his fellow-workers. But be the question one of religion, morals or the case of a sick comrade, the Jocist is bound to seek immediately for some course of action. Here the organization, by its various sections and groups, provides him with the necessary channel.

The organic unit of the J.O.C. is the parochial section. This is directed by a committee chosen from the members, and it is divided into " teams " which work the several districts of the parish. Each team has a " seasoned " member at its head. A chaplain represents parochial authority.

These sections, in turn, are grouped in federations which cover any given industrial area. A federal committee visits and strengthens the local sections and assumes responsibility for large-scale measures taken with regard to any question of import. Each month a federal council, consisting of section delegates, assembles and examines the month's

[1] *E.g.*, the massed marriages under the ægis of Jocist Father Roy which took place some months ago in Montreal. [2] *E.g.*, *André Jacques, un Militant Jociste*, Fr Piat, O.F.M.

activity. Plans are made for the coming month according to orders received from the Secrétariat-Général, which is at the apex of the Jocist organization. It looks to all the workings of the movement, surveys the publication of journals and propaganda and ensures the functioning of the various departments.

The Women's J.O.C. has its own central secretariat. Once a year a national council of federation delegates meets.

It will be noted that such an organization is calculated to develop, first and foremost, a sense of personal responsibility in the members. Much depends on the work of the militants.[1] They sell the journals from house to house, establish contact with other workers, interesting them in the movement and bringing them to meetings. They spread propaganda by word of mouth and by the many brochures furnished by the J.O.C. The chief Jocist organ of propaganda is its fortnightly journal *La Jeunesse Ouvrière*, which has a circulation of 150,000 copies. One of its most important functions is the starting of the many campaigns against abuses. There are some seven other papers, appearing at varying intervals, the largest of which is *La Jeunesse Ouvrière Féminine*, which has a monthly sale of 175,000. During the past few years there have been launched, mainly by means of these journals, some twelve national campaigns, such as the campaign for the workers' safety against accidents, the apprenticeship campaign or the campaign for a three weeks' vacation for younger workers. Much success has attended these movements, and they have attracted the attention and co-operation of the B.I.T.[2]

Of great practical importance also are the various " service " departments which deal with insurance, savings, leisure-hour occupations, illness, strikes; and last, but not least, there is the special soldiers' branch. The young worker is thus surrounded by numerous evidences of fellowship and comradeship which are reminiscent of early Christian days. In sickness or in trouble his associates and their great comprehensive organization are behind him.

In conclusion, a word must be said as to the position of the chaplain. The chaplain is not the president of the

[1] Interesting matter on the choice and work of the militants, *La J.O.C. dans les Petites Villes*, pp. 10 *f.*, 21 *f.* [2] Bureau International du Travail.

section. He does not direct operations. The workers are their own leaders, the priest is their guide. His is rather the rôle of counsellor. It must be remembered that there exists in French working-class circles a considerable amount of anti-clericalism, the legacy of the Revolution and, indeed, of later disorders. Therefore one of the obstacles encountered by the J.O.C. is a certain mistrust engendered by the presence of the clergy in its ranks. Its task is to show that the chaplain represents God. His is one of the many orders which go to make up the Christian social scheme, and he has a definite and particular function. He must attend all the meetings, but he must never preside. He is there to guide and to assist with his superior learning, but he may not, in any sense, pontificate. One of his chief duties in the J.O.C. is to help in the formation of the militants and to act as their spiritual director.[1]

Finally, there is not, as is frequently supposed, any *organic* contact between the neo-Thomists and Jocism. "No more," as the Assistant Chaplain-General of the Belgian movement wrote to me, "than there is between the Fellows of Trinity College and the workers at Guinness's." To amplify this, Thomism is the philosophy recommended by the Roman see, but its exponents have no real connexion with the J.O.C., though M. Maritain, and for that matter all Roman Catholics who are Thomists, are very friendly towards the movement.

Jocism has shown once more the necessity of mass movement. Jocists need not fear the present catastrophe. War cannot destroy such a movement. It can but retard it for a little, because the Lord builds the house and its foundations are sure.

It is fitting that I should here record my thanks to several generous helpers: M. l'Abbé Guérin of Paris, the Belgian Assistant Chaplain-General, M. l'Abbé Kothen, and Father Declan of Holy Cross, Ardoyne. But specially am I indebted to my old friend M. Alfred Brunel of the Maison des Francs-Bourgeois, Paris.

H. R. McAdoo.

[1] A good example of the type of devotional literature produced by the J.O.C. is Bordet's commentary, *Regards Jocistes sur l'Evangile*. It is personal and evangelical in its appeal.

Church, State, and Mr Gladstone

II.—MR GLADSTONE: THE CHURCHMAN

I

Has any biographer or commentator ever put the question: Would Mr Gladstone have preferred to go down to history as a great Christian or as a great churchman? The form of the query may be cumbersome, even offensive; yet there is a distinction; great Christians, at least in modern times, have not always been great churchmen, nor great churchmen always extraordinary exemplars of the specifically Christian character. The distinction granted, we have in hand a clue through the labyrinthine paths of this unique career. There was a time—the days of *Church and State* and of *Church Principles*—when that demonic energy and that teeming brain, labouring with undigested thoughts on things human and divine which Oxford, travel, reading, friendships had provided, seemed to suggest that the ages to come would recall him first and foremost as one who served the Church of England through a long parliamentary career only because God had not thought him worthy to fulfil His will as pastor and prelate in the more sacred Ministry of holy things. The student of Christ Church was in office at twenty-five, but the two treatises just mentioned and the Diaries remain to prove that the early desire for ordination had been no mere phase of adolescent idealism. *Punch* (February 21, 1891) was right when in a cartoon, "The G.O.M., Variety Entertainer," it imagined Mr Gladstone with some ten hands and in a dozen rôles—a true British workman, the grand old agriculturalist, a schoolmaster . . . and a bishop. One remembers Morley's "Nature had endowed him with many towering gifts," or, better, those words which Morley selected as the concluding climax to his far-reaching chronicle: "Be inspired with the belief that life is a great and noble calling . . . an elevated and lofty destiny." An iron physical constitution as of fine steel, a first-class brain, high moral principles early adopted and strenuously disciplined, a resolute and instant obedience to that Will wherein is our peace—given these and set their possessor among the ordained members of the Church and history would have been bound to record in large type the acts and thoughts of a great churchman—one worthy to

stand in the succession of Anglo-Saxon kings and bishops, of medieval chancellors and patrons of sound learning, of the " great reformers," of the teachers, prophets and evangelists from whom the M.P. for Newark quoted or to whom he referred in those two early writings. *Church Principles*, especially, is a treatise which explains how apt was Morley's other remark that Mr Gladstone was not only a practising Christian: " He was a Christian steeped in the fourth century, steeped in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries . . . the roots were as unmistakable as the leafage, the blossom and the fruits " (*Life*, I, 201).

But all this belongs to the year 1840, and the English scene was transformed radically and permanently as the next half-century passed by. To measure that change is a necessary preliminary to an estimate of Mr Gladstone's stature, whether as statesman, Christian or churchman. We have to ask how did the Minister and Party Leader serve his religion and his church in times when the visible temple seemed in process of dissolution, when internally churchmen spoke ill of one another and externally rough and hostile hands were seeking to exploit political partisanship in the interests of the work of destruction ? The answer to the question can be no more than a brief hint; unceasing activity and unresting versatility preclude any adequate summary. Never all through that long and arduous life did the mind or the will flag in facing the immediate implications of " the mighty question: What is the nature of a Church, and what the duties, titles, symbols of faithful membership ?" The statesman was also a churchman, the man of affairs a man of God; here was a mind occupied with the affairs of state, preoccupied also with a never-ceasing inquiry into the nature of that other Order which some have called *Civitas Dei* : its eternal foundations and its mundane reflection on the stage of human history. Any odd collection of Mr Gladstone's correspondence, for instance, demonstrates how even in the busiest pressure of official duties he never wholly neglected his concern in the well-being of the Church, or the progress of the inquiry into the grounds of belief. One letter may deal with the delinquencies of some awkward colleague; you turn the page and find the Prime Minister inditing an epistle to some Presbyterian divine on the hypothesis of a final restoration and the *Autobiography* of J. S. Mill.

There is another and not less honourable reason why not

so much as a catalogue of Mr Gladstone's services to religion and sacred learning can be compiled. He did not advertise his sacrifice of time or money. Morley hinted at figures computing his gifts to charity and works of mercy, but the exact fraction or sum-total of his benefactions will never be known, or known only to those who bear his name, or remembered only in those places which were the special objects of his personal interest—notably (but not only) Fasque, Glenalmond, Seaforth, Hawarden—or in more distant regions where piety and scholarship are still promoted by those societies whose cause he furthered with voice and pen and purse. Much that he did and gave must, for the generality, belong to the category of good deeds Time overlays but does not destroy:

> " That best portion of a good man's life,
> His nameless, unremembered, acts of kindness."

We come then to his public support and championship of sound Church principles. There is no room for more than a brief mention of what he was able to effect for the Scottish Episcopal Church—his part for instance, in the election of Bishop Forbes in 1847 (by which that Church was provided with a worthy champion on the Tractarian side) and, again, his resolute stand in 1862 for the adoption of the Scottish Liturgy—an instance where ultimate, though not immediate, success rewarded a careful regard for seasons and for opposing susceptibilities. On both occasions it was due to Mr Gladstone's persistent patience that in the end the issues were removed from " the region of proscription and passion " into a happier atmosphere of " calm discussion which ripens and deepens opinion."

Next, take another phase of his ecclesiastical activity, in which he touched one of the crucial features of our own (Anglican) history: expansion overseas. Mr Gladstone's advance in public position coincided with the phenomenal development of the Anglican communion throughout the British colonies and dependencies, in India and elsewhere. His services were of two kinds: both have relevance to a process still unfinished. From about 1825 the two great missionary societies were at work over a wide field from Quebec to Calcutta, setting forward evangelistic, pastoral, and educational projects for the colonial and the native populations. In the thirties, still more in the forties, the need for episcopal leadership and supervision became urgent. It is one of the

debts posterity owes to Bishop Blomfield that that urgent problem was set in a fair way to solution—and it ought not to be forgotten that no layman grasped the urgency and the dimensions of the problem more rapidly than W. E. Gladstone. He was, in point of fact (along with Manning !), one of the speakers at the inaugural meeting of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund, April 27, 1841. Within ten years no less than fifteen new sees had been founded, the early history of some being part of the larger history of the English Church—*e.g.*, those over which G. A. Selwyn, Robert Gray, and William Tyrrell were chosen to rule. Each succeeding decade saw further new dioceses planted.

Hence came a further work to be done for the colonial Church—one which could only be done by a man in Mr Gladstone's position and possessing his talents. The fifties brought the inevitable problem: what was to be the relationship of the new Colonial Churches to Canterbury and to the Colonial Office ? As everyone knows, that question was decided in the only way compatible with progress among the new democratic communities—the Anglican Communion overseas went forward along the path of freedom and independence, " on a basis of voluntary consensual compact which was the basis on which the Church of Christ rested from the first." The three colonial bishops above mentioned were the protagonists in that campaign; they relied for the presentation of their cause at home, in ecclesiastical convocations by Bishop Wilberforce, in the House of Commons by Mr Gladstone. By 1872 each of the four great Dominions had drafted, discussed and adopted its own constitution. Such is the bare outline of Mr Gladstone's services to the Church in the Colonies—by itself enough to warrant honourable and grateful remembrance in the bede-roll of the benefactors of *Ecclesia Anglicana.*

II

Above all else, however, English churchmen are in debt to Mr Gladstone for his words and works during a period of readjustment in the relationship of Church and community in these islands. Some modification of that relationship and some internal reconstruction of the ecclesiastical polity had, long before he became Prime Minister, become desirable, urgent, inevadable; the only questions were whether the process would be rough, radical, and revolu-

tionary or evolutionary, ameliorative and recreative; and, for the defenders of the Church, what was the wise and proper spirit in which to meet a transition both painful and inevitable. Again and again it was Mr Gladstone who on large questions of principle, and on lesser details of policy, helped the Church and the nation to give the right answer. Disraeli said truly in the franchise debates of 1867 that religion had given the new electorate something to argue about, and *The Times* somewhat later endeavoured to argue that, as the liveliest wing of the Liberal Party was pledged to disestablishment in England as in Ireland, that Mr Gladstone was the leader of the Liberal Party, that therefore Mr Gladstone must be privately intending to do in England what had been done in Ireland. But this is the kind of logic more in favour with journalists than with statesmen. No one was ever less a servile servant of the time-spirit than Mr Gladstone, no one knew better how to adjust policy to the necessities of time and place; he disestablished the Church of Ireland but not the Church in Wales; in England he steadily refused to capitulate to the disestablishment agitation provoked and sustained by the Nonconformist and Radicals.

In England what he did was to carry out with masterly strategy a long critical stage of the retreat from Hooker. He prepared churchmen for the day (not yet at its noon) which should bring forth the fruits of Roman Catholic emancipation, of " godless " universities and " unsectarian " schools, and of a " theistic " Legislature the members of which believe (in theory) in a purely theoretical deity. He saw (as we can see to-day) that ever since the advent of Utility, Reform, and Emancipation, the Church of England had been gradually manœuvred into an untenable position. He saw that every evidence of the rebuilding of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, every foundation of a Methodist Chapel in any obscure village or northern township, every undenominational school and college, every widening of the circles of agnostic speculation, every blow to the financial, social, and spiritual predominance of every incumbent, spelled the necessity of a re-examination of the title deeds of the Establishment and the realignment of its position, *vis-à-vis* the Crown, the State, the Community.

Prolonged consideration came to a head in 1847—one memorable date in his long career. In August he was elected member for Oxford University; in December he

spoke and voted in favour of Roman Catholic Relief and of the admission of Jews to Parliament. On both issues he contradicted his own earlier arguments of a decade before. It was a painful reversal and his action brought him protests from many of his constituents, from Dr Pusey and from his father. He knew he was, however reluctantly, assisting the transition to a secular theory of civil institutions, to "the mechanical State" as he phrased it, but when the gap between theory and fact had become "a hopeless falsehood" and a "mischievous imposture" it was best both for nation and Church to "unveil realities," and to move forward towards new fields of thought and labour and hope.[1] The member for Newark who had argued against the removal of disabilities imposed on Romanists, Dissenters, Jews, had observed that much had changed outside since his entry into the House fifteen years before. Not only numbers but tempers had altered. Twenty years later, in the debate on the Irish Church Bill, March 23, 1869, having undergone a further "great transformation," the member for Greenwich, now Prime Minister, interposed in the course of his argument on the ecclesiastical situation in Ireland a few sentences of general application:

> In proportion as Dissent and differences of opinion creep into the country, the foundations of the religious Establishment . . . come to be by degrees more or less weakened and impaired, partly in proportion as the number of Dissenters is strong, partly in proportion as they are disposed or not disposed to acquiesce in the continuance of the Establishment.

That incidental reference to governing political principle may perhaps serve as a summary of the result of nearly forty years' observation and meditation. It may best be interpreted (as to the speaker's own wishes and hopes) by a private remark of some five years later: "My object and desire has ever been, and still is, to keep the Church of England together, both as a Church and as an Establishment"; it should certainly be interpreted (as to the disposition of dissent) by Lord Granville's report of a visit to Bradford in 1877 when Mr Gladstone wished to dwell on the Eastern Question and other subjects dear to him—but his audience "didn't care twopence about the Eastern Question,

[1] To Manning, March 12, 1848; Lathbury, II, pp. 279-280.

country franchise, or anything else," but only about "Miall and Disestablishment."[1] Birmingham of course showed the same predilection as Bradford, and that report of Lord Granville's illustrates clearly and concisely the situation as between the friends of the Church and Establishment and the would-be destroyers of the historic order; it demonstrates that the real defenders of that order were the few who, like Mr Gladstone, welcomed the progress towards the general abolition of all civil disabilities of an ecclesiastical or theological origin. He knew, as he had told Mrs Gladstone in 1845, that the time had come when the true defence of the Church would bring misunderstanding and calumny upon the defender; it would be necessary to defend the Church at the cost of seeming to be a traitor to it in the eyes of those who, though loving liberty, preferred gold to freedom.

There is the crux of Mr Gladstone's contribution as a politician to the health, wealth and unity of the Church: his elucidation and propagation of the true principles of Church defence. "It is not," he once wrote, "every defence that is really such"; some methods of defence provoke more oppositions and evils than they do good; the Church must decline to rely on the fleshly arm, her battlefield is not the floor of the House of Commons but the hearts and homes of English men and women; "as the Church grows out-of-doors she will be more felt indoors." No defamation or denigration of his character or gifts can alter the fact that it is due to Mr Gladstone that civil equality in the State and freedom for the Church did slowly broaden down and not arrive in some violent upheaval with impoverishing and disrupting dislocation. At the moment when Whiggism was giving way to a Radicalism whereof the leaders were the new men from Birmingham and the North, he, by his political position and personal influence, made easy the transition from the dying past of privilege and predominance to the new era of less privilege and more liberty—more Life and Liberty, may we say? His statecraft in this delicate region is only one major illustration of that quality in Mr Gladstone upon which Lord Acton once lingered—his capacity for mental growth even in his old age. Thackeray once said about something quite different (memories of foreign travel) that a man can live in 1830 and in 1860; with Mr Gladstone

[1] *Life*, by Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, II, 171.

in our minds let us add, " and in 1890." A man must live in the present, and a statesman as well in the years that are to be. It was because he did work in the present with his eye on the future that Mr Gladstone showed the Church he loved how best to sustain and increase her influence in the nation, in the Empire, in the world.

That the Church of England " as an establishment " has survived not only the Victorian but the Edwardian, Georgian and neo-Georgian eras is at least an interesting and significant phenomenon. What is of greater moment is that the Church of England " as a Church " has not only survived but has quickened, expanded, risen to the challenge of new days, increased in efficiency, in zeal, in learning and spirituality. And the credit of that surprising survival and that healthy transformation is due more than to any other single leader in that mid-Victorian transition to Mr Gladstone. He himself did more than any other son of the Church to bring to pass his own prophecy, made in the dark days of the Gorham Judgment: " She will live through her struggles, she has a great providential destiny before her."

W. G. Addison.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. E. L. Mascall, O.G.S., is Sub-Warden of the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln.

Mr Jenkins is a Commonwealth Fund Fellow and, until recently, was a theological student at Mansfield College, Oxford. He is entering the Congregationalist Ministry.

Mr Williams is on the staff of the Oxford University Press. He has written " Divites Dimisit " specially for this number of Theology. His poem " Taliessin through Logres " was the subject of an article by Mr C. S. Lewis in the March number of Theology.

Dr Stewart is Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the General Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Rev. H. R. McAdoo is a Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin, a Gold Medallist in Modern Languages and the holder of the Médaille du Gouvernement Français. He is Junior Curate of the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity, Waterford.

The Rev. W. G. Addison is Vicar of Britford, Salisbury. His article is a sequel to that which appeared last month.

The Rev. T. Grigg-Smith is Rector of Chipstead, Surrey.

Brother George Every is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

NOTES

Theology has now been published in its new form for twelve months. Its circulation steadily increased month by month up to the outbreak of the war. There was then a slight setback, as was naturally to be expected, but so many of our readers have told us of the importance which they attach to the maintenance of Theology during the war that we hope for a continued increase in circulation in spite of the difficulties of the present time. May we suggest that an annual subscription to Theology (12s.) is a suitable Christmas present? During December the S.P.C.K. is also willing to accept subscriptions for six months at the same rate—*i.e.*, 6s. (post free). It may be added that Book Tokens can be accepted for either a yearly or half-yearly subscription for future issues. In any case all readers are urged to place a regular order either with the S.P.C.K. or with their local bookseller, since during the war only a very limited number of sale-or-return copies are available.

The Cicestrian (Michaelmas Term, 1939) contains a long article by Mr J. N. Comper, entitled " Of the Atmosphere of a Church."

We gladly call attention to it, for otherwise it may escape the attention of many readers who would wish to see it. Copies of the magazine can be obtained for 1s. from the Theological College, Chichester.

WHY WE ARE AT WAR

(*The following are extracts from a sermon which was preached by the Archbishop of Armagh shortly after the outbreak of the war.*)

This war has been forced upon us. The incorporation of Poland into Germany was to be followed by that of one small nation after another until Germany ruled Europe. That is why France and Britain are fighting. Not for the sake of high ideals, but to maintain the balance of power in Europe. Undoubtedly matters such as the safeguarding of the rights of small nations, defence of a Christian as against a paganized form of civilization, the reign of justice rather than the enthronement of the principle that "might is right," tend to give to the war a touch of crusading idealism, but these are not the reasons why we are at war.

We are at war because if Poland is crushed to-day, our own turn will come to-morrow or the day after.

I want this point to be quite clear in order that we may not deceive ourselves. We are looking ahead and we know that, even if we have not been ourselves attacked, the attack upon us is only a matter of time if Germany is not checked, and that from a position becoming every year more unfavourable to us; and so in seeking to defend Poland we are defending ourselves.

And I want this to be quite clear because it will save us from any self-righteous notion that this is a war fought by us just in order to champion high ideals.

Our success, I trust, will serve high ideals, but high ideals are spiritual things and can only be successfully fought for with spiritual weapons. They can only be made to prevail by persuading people of their desirableness, and it would be the sheerest folly to seek to propagate spiritual ideals by force of arms.

It is by no means certain that in an appeal to arms the right will triumph; we are warned that those who take the sword run the risk of perishing by the sword. . . . Remember that force can never settle which was the right cause. Conscience and the verdict of history can alone pronounce on this matter. And so, if our side wins, let us not fatuously say "That proves we were in the right," nor, if we lose, let us petulantly complain that God has espoused the unrighteous cause. No victory, in either direction, can pass a verdict on the moral question. All that arms can do is to tell which was the stronger nation.

Crush down, as far as you can, all bad feeling towards those against whom we are fighting. Refuse to think it part of your duty to be a good hater. We may resist our enemies, but we do not need to hate them. It is only for a season that they are at enmity with us.

THE *ACTION FRANÇAISE*

In an article in THEOLOGY for June, 1939, I referred to Pius XI's condemnation of the *Action Française*. It is significant that one of the first acts of his successor has been to remove that condemnation. A decree of the Holy Office dated July 5, 1939, states that the ban on the newspaper has been raised, though the numbers published in the interval since the condemnation of December 29, 1926, are to remain on the Index.[1]

The reason for the removal of the condemnation is stated in the decree to be that the directors of the newspaper had petitioned Pius XI shortly before his death, expressing sincere regrets for their previous tone of hostility and promising amendment for the future. It has been clear for some time past that the *Action Française* was moderating its tone, and it seems that various approaches were made to the Vatican, notably a petition to Pius XI on November 20, 1938, and another to Pius XII on June 19, 1939. It was the latter which was the immediate cause of the new decree.

How deep the change of mind in the *Action Française* goes is doubtful. The petition seems to make a distinction. While all express their regret for any words which may have been used disrespectful for the Papacy, it is " those among us who are Catholics " who renounce all doctrines contrary to the teaching of the Church, and it has been pointed out that this phrase, while strictly correct, leaves Charles Maurras the most outstanding personality of the movement, completely free to continue as before, since he is not a practising Catholic. Moreover, the decree of the Holy Office, while warning the bishops to exercise vigilance and to promote Catholic Action, allows the newspaper to continue unchanged. It is said to be unprecedented that a condemned organ, even after submission, should be allowed to continue under the direction of the same man who still holds the same doctrines.

It is not possible to divine all that lies behind the change in papal policy It is said to be due to the influence of prominent lay intellectuals of reactionary views—it is noteworthy that in

[1] I may refer those who wish for a more detailed account of the movement and the circumstances of its condemnation to an article of mine in the *Cambridge Historical Journal*, vol. iii, 1930.

1936 Maurras was condemned to imprisonment for incitement to murder owing to the extreme violence of his attacks upon Léon Blum, and that in 1938 he was elected to the *Académie Française*—and to be not altogether pleasing to the French hierarchy, who are now of more republican and democratic sympathies. It may, however, be safely asserted that the condemnation of the *Action Française* divided Catholic opinion in France and that Pius XII desires to close the ranks of Catholics against the growing danger of Communism and Nazism and to pursue a policy which may heal the many divisions left by that of his predecessor.

R. E. Balfour.

A NOTE ON PROVIDENCE AND PRAYER

Perhaps a layman may be allowed to draw attention to two related problems which the war will necessarily bring into prominence.

(1) God's overruling providence will no doubt be questioned.

(*a*) It will be necessary to explain that God is not responsible for the war—*we* are (*i.e.*, not just Hitler and the Nazis, but all of us who have not submitted to the divine guidance into the divine peace). Yet God does not stop the war, for He does not interfere with our freedom of choice. The direct responsibility is ours: though God is responsible also, inasmuch as He has ordained a universe in which sin necessarily brings about its own undoing. Thus, since we have brought it about in the natural course of events, this war is properly to be regarded as punishment for sin. We must, however, carefully distinguish between the permissive and the jussive will of God: the war is not a "visitation" from outside, but a natural consequence *within* the process.

(*b*) In view of the enormous, often quite unconscious, influence of scientific thought, evolutionism, and naturalism even upon the theologically elect, it is very necessary to consider that, though God does not stop the war, and so interfere with human freedom, yet His dealings with men are not only passive and collective, but also active and individual. Granted the fact that God permits the war, and the fact also that He is immanently concerned in the flight of every bullet (for without God's sustaining will there could be no ballistics); these facts do not, however, imply the confounding of innocent and guilty under a general ban. God is not a scientific thinker, concerned for the type or the average; regardless of the individual and the unique. He is concerned about every individual sparrow or hair of our heads, and certainly about every individual taking part in the war. If an innocent man die, it is his vocation so to do: his death is

part of God's general plan for the production of good out of evil, and is at the same time part of God's special plan for the salvation of this particular individual. If it be best that the innocent, who relies upon God, should not perish, then God, who created the universe and established its laws, can certainly deflect the course of a bullet. Such miracles, in which the higher, spiritual law modifies the operation of a "natural law," are abundantly acknowledged by the Church.

We recognize God's hand in the universal order, and recently stress has again been laid upon the Hebraic notion of His guiding and controlling hand in the process of history; but we must not ignore His fundamental paternal relationship to every soul and His sovereign authority over all circumstances of its physical embodiment. Injury or death may be the punishment of sin, or a vocation to Christian witness, or both; but whoever relies on God will not suffer, unless his suffering should be not only of general value, but also a part of God's special plan for him, and so to be regarded on all counts as a positive good. Anything less than the complete dovetailing of a particular plan for every individual with the scheme of general salvation would be inadequate to the Christian conception of the Fatherhood of God.

(2) Questions about the efficacy and the proper objects of prayer are especially relevant.

Prayer submits the human will to the divine, so that the latter may become effective in the field of human freedom. The close physical and mental interdependence of human beings suggests a similar spiritual interdependence and justifies intercession; while belief in the communion of saints strengthens the Church Militant with the knowledge that it is supported by the prayers of the Church Expectant and Triumphant.

There may be little danger this time of jingoistic prayer. We are taught to acknowledge our own part in the present catastrophe; to pray that we may be cleansed by such suffering as we may be called upon to undergo; and to intercede for the German people. This is sound, but it is not enough. There is a danger that rarefied spirituality may ignore the obvious. In the face of a selfish materialism many churchmen have become so self-consciously altruistic as almost to have abandoned common human feeling to the humanitarianism of the materialists themselves (humanitarianism being an outcome of the sentimentality which always accompanies spiritual petrifaction). We must insist, then, that it is natural and right to pray especially for our own relations and friends; such prayers are most fervent and most informed. Our intercessions may then proceed in widening circles for our locality, our country, our allies; also, of course, for the German people and for Herr Hitler and his staff. Moreover, it is not selfish to pray for ourselves; we probably know our own needs better than anyone, except God. And naturally we must be concerned with ourselves, even perhaps with our

own selfishness. It is not selfish to pray for relief from the burden of our own selfishness. But, further, there is surely nothing wrong in praying for our own physical safety—and, of course, for the physical safety of others—provided that, as in every other prayer, we state or imply our submission to God's will. To pray merely that our sufferings may be accepted implies that only suffering possesses positive value in our earthly life. But orthodox Christianity is "humanistic," recognizing the positive values in a variety of earthly experience; and the Church has thus traditionally prayed for our defence against physical, as well as moral and spiritual, evil. And God, our Heavenly Father, will not cause more than the barest minimum of necessary suffering to those who entirely trust Him.

During the last century, under the constant attacks of scientific naturalism, the Church tended to limit its operations (and its conception of God's transcendent activity) to a "spiritual" sphere divorced from the material and autonomous. The time has come to recapture lost ground; to recognize miraculous intervention in the physical world and the value of prayer for physical blessings, which the Church has traditionally employed. The shamefaced attitude of "enlightened" clergy before the question of prayers for rain is a measure of their submission to a pseudo-scientific and unchristian metaphysic which scientists themselves are no longer interested to maintain. Similarly, a refusal to pray for our own safety implies denial of (*a*) the values of the earthly life (for which, incidentally, we are at war); (*b*) God's concern for our physical well-being (though we are worth many sparrows); and (*c*) our own weakness and sin, our need of comfort and of time to repent and make something valuable of our lives.

Excessive "spirituality" and unreal altruism are genuine dangers in the Church to-day, since they imply a false attitude to the values inherent in the natural order.

S. L. Bethell.

CORRESPONDENCE

ECCLESIASTICAL TRANSCENDENTALISM?

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

I have read with the deepest interest Professor Quick's valuable letter in your November number. But the issues he raises are of such fundamental importance that I venture some comment in the hope of provoking further discussion.

I agree with Dr Quick that the apocalyptic school of Christian

social critics, of whom among Anglicans perhaps the most profound is the Rev. J. V. L. Casserley, do tend sometimes almost to *desire* catastrophe in the hope that men may look and learn, and that this desire is not perhaps indefinitely removed from a willingness to assist in the provocation of the disaster. But, if that is an improper procedure, its impropriety does not invalidate the fact that, at such a time as the present, the primary task of the Church is prophetical. If Christian teachers do not seek, by appeal to the revelation of God in Christ, to make sense of the appalling conflicts in which we are involved, it is hard to see who else will. To perform such a task effectively, a measure of detachment is surely imperative.

One of the weaknesses of Canon Quick's letter is his apparent refusal to admit the propriety of the Church's undertaking any prophetic interpretation of the events through which we are living. Most English Christians would admit that the occasion of England's declaration of war on Germany was just. But to say that surely does not involve them in the acceptance of the superficial analytic of the European tragedy, accepted in official quarters, with its truly terrifying ignorance of the spiritual issues of the conflict. At such a time as the present the voice of the Church must be an independent voice. For it is surely her claim to possess, through the revelation of God in Christ, an insight into the conflicts which rend mankind asunder individually and collectively, denied to the unaided natural reason. Of course one may deny, with the liberals, that there has been divine revelation, or assert, as some Protestants are represented as asserting, that such a revelation affords us no enlightenment concerning the manifold of human relations. But the classical Catholic doctrine surely allows, nay rather compels, us to illuminate our natural perplexities by the grace given unto us.

Would Dr Quick deny this? What I have said has, of course, been worked out at length by Fr Demant both in *Christian Polity* and in *The Religious Prospect*. At times I must admit that I am afraid Dr Quick is concerned altogether to deny a distinctively prophetic vocation to the Church. But what worries me most are the very curious views he seems to propound concerning the relations of grace and nature. I have said before in THEOLOGY (May, 1939) that it is here fundamentally that Christians are divided in their response to the crisis of our time, and for myself I cannot believe that here Dr Quick is guilty of anything less than serious theological inexactitude.

First of all I would ask how far we can endorse his extreme moralism. His ethical views seem largely conceived in terms of rights and duties, and I suspect a Kantian bias. Now I am convinced that Kant's attempt to establish ethics as an *a priori* science independent of psychology was a major philosophical disaster, and I cannot believe that Dr Quick

does any service to the cause which he is concerned to defend by opposing to the Nazi doctrine of blood and soil a formal moralism, such as is defended in Oxford to-day by academic moralists of the school of Professor H. A. Prichard and Sir W. D. Ross. If the Christian is opposed to the Nazi, apart from the religious pretensions of the latter, it is surely because his dethronement of reason and his absolutization of uncontrolled racial or group impulse are contrary to the proper pattern of human nature. But the Christian will be concerned to admit the partial validity of the Nazi's protest against the mechanization of life (a mechanization that has often gone hand in hand with the defence of just such an arid moralism as Canon Quick is defending) in precisely the same way as he was prepared to endorse much that the late Mr D. H. Lawrence said concerning sexual relations.

What the Christian is concerned to do is to furnish the conditions of the possibility of a natural social order, and those conditions are surely primarily afforded by that grace of God in Jesus Christ which, by raising him to a supernatural plane, gives to man at once insight enough and power enough to commence that task. Catholic theology contends that man, *spoliatus gratuitis*, is necessarily *vulneratus in naturalibus*. Canon Quick is suggesting in effect that man, thus wounded, must first be restored to normal, and then only be regarded as a subject for the operation of divine grace. Whereas surely the Christian Church has claimed that it is only through the grace of God, and its fruit of forgiveness of sin and of supernatural life, that the first step can be taken towards that renewal of the natural, which is social revolution.

To see Old and New Testaments opposed as Canon Quick does is surely exegetical superficiality. Rather, both testify to the same saving truths—*e.g.*, that God saves through a remnant, clear-sighted enough and brave enough to bear witness to His truth in moments of crisis and disaster. If there are those who in the present situation claim we must take that theology seriously, it is because they are profoundly uncertain whether through war can be found any cure for the evils of Europe. (Of the kind of methods modern warfare inevitably employs strong things have been said by theologians.) They remember that the Church is an instrument, the appointed instrument, of the accomplishment of the divine purpose for the world. That purpose is not fulfilled on earth, but only when man attains to the " vision of God in the communion of saints at the resurrection of the body." None the less, through the work of God's good grace the world has known in its temporal history more than one Christian revolution when an order, more or less natural, has been established. In that establishment the Church, which is the vessel of His grace, played its part. Is not, perhaps, its rôle to-day to seek to detach itself as far as possible from the conflict, looking both to things eternal and to a future

which, if in the darkness its ministry has only been of prophecy, reconciliation and compassion, it may have some share in shaping?

Yours, etc.,

D. M. MACKINNON.

KEBLE COLLEGE,
OXFORD.
November 10, 1939.

COMMENT ON FRENCH PERIODICALS

The disadvantages of the Establishment in this country, the trials to which the Church is put on this account, its consequent lethargy and vacillations—these things are not new to Englishmen. The possibility that in war-time bishops and curates will be expected by the bureaucrats to encourage the nation with moral platitudes or an Anglican Jahwism fills with trepidation the hearts of all men who call themselves Christians before they call themselves Englishmen. It is, in consequence, very interesting to read of the difficulties between Church and State in a country where the Church is not only disestablished, but where the secular laws are violently anti-religious though they have at the moment by common consent fallen into abeyance. The recent effort on the part of several men to abolish the French anti-clerical laws (made only at the beginning of the present century) is the subject of an article, *Autour des libertés d'association et d'enseignement*, by Yves de la Brière, in *Études* (July 5). By the laws *Waldeck-Rousseau* (1901) and *Combes* (1904) the rights of religious orders to assemble and to teach are removed. Since the last war the religious have in fact re-established themselves with the full support of public opinion, but the laws are still on the statute book, and might, should an anti-clerical government obtain power, be reintroduced in all their rigour. To those who see the Church of France as one of the brighter stars in a befogged Christendom, and who know how easily and how frequently anti-clericalism of a most virulent type raises its head in that country, this article on the hoped-for extinction of the pernicious laws *Waldeck-Rousseau* and *Combes* will be of great interest. It is hoped to achieve this by two projects of even more formidable title: *Meillet-Poliman*, which would secure special rights for religious as *anciens combattants* or the heirs of such; and *Pebillier-Riou-Devaud*, which proposes the abrogation of those sections of the *Waldeck-Rousseau* law which apply separate legislation to the religious orders, as distinct from other corporations, and the complete abrogation of the *Combes* law.

Every number of *Études* provides the reader with stimulating and entertaining matter, both in reviews and original articles.

The Prado exhibition at Geneva is excellently written of by Maurice Morel in the issues of July 20 and August 5-20. In the July 5 number is quite an enchanting critical essay by Louis Barjon, which is chiefly about the recent open-air productions of Racine's legal satire *Les Plaideurs* on the very steps of the Palais de Justice. "*Rien de plus piquant assurément que cette hospitalité libéralement offerte par nos magistrats, en leur propre maison, aux railleries de la procédure.*" Whether they would be equally hospitable to a contemporary satire is another affair: it is easy to be magnanimous three centuries after the event; and it is pleasant. For one can enhance the irony of the situation, and yet escape unscathed oneself.

Études carries the sub-title *Revue catholique d'intérêt général* ; nor do its contents belie this style, as will have been seen from the few remarks in the paragraph above. But, however seductive may be the topical essays and literary reviews therein contained —and from a review André Billy's new novel *Introibo* should read well—it is certainly the expressly religious and theological essays which form the most important part of its contents. In the issue of June 20, Paul Doncœur treats (in the *Bulletin de liturgie pratique*) of a subject which is far more practicable in our Church than in his own. His article deals mainly with the proper of the mass, and his desire is not only that it should cover the ceremonial as it used to do, but that the people should take an active part in it. In England we try to make the people join in the service by giving them hymns to sing, whose verses are usually as jejune as the tunes are beyond the range and powers of the congregation. Many no doubt have thought of restoring the proper to its ancient importance: but nothing has been done to any general effect. M. Doncœur's article is full of intelligent suggestions which could with very great ease be adopted in the Anglican Church (if only on account of our use of the vernacular and of having a chant of our own as well as the plainchant), and would certainly be of great help to any Anglican (if such there be) who has some similar plan in mind.

The two other periodicals in French which have been received for comment are Belgian publications. The *Nouvelle revue théologique* is a sturdy affair which contains, besides reviews, liturgical, scriptural and pastoral notes, and *Actes du Saint-Siège*, articles which should please scholars who specialize in the different branches of the theological science. Some of these appear in several instalments. *Le sacerdoce et le sacrifice de Jésus-Christ d'après l'Épitre aux Hébreux*, *L'épopée babylonienne de Gilgamesh d'après les recherches récentes*, *Les "monastères doubles": leur histoire, surtout en Belgique*, are titles from the June and July issues and show something of the scope of this Jesuitical monthly (though not all its contributors are Jesuits). Any doings at the Prieuré d'Amay-sur-Meuse are bound to be interesting to those who follow and seek to forward the friendly relations between the

Eastern and Western Churches. Their magazine *Irénikon* gives excellent accounts of the doings of the various Churches and of movements like that of Faith and Order. The essays seek to throw light on the various traditions by dealing with the lives or works of personages. February and March give a very absorbing one on that enigmatical prelate, the Patriarch Cyril Lukaris, in whom is best seen the effect of the Western Reformation on its Eastern contemporaries.

B. J. Kett.

SURVEYS

(A) RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: THE NEED FOR RESEARCH

Of the books here considered the most important is *Religion and the Growing Mind*, by B. A. Yeaxlee (Nisbet, 7s. 6d.). Those who have attempted serious study of what has come to be called religious education must for long have been conscious of dire need in two important directions: (i) original research; and (ii) authoritative treatment, and where possible resolution, of the disagreements of those who are eminent in their respective educational or kindred spheres. Dr Yeaxlee's book belongs to the second of these categories, although it illustrates abundantly the paucity of the first. What concerns the teacher of religion more than anything else is the apprehension of the living God, step by step and year by year, in the developing mind and life of the learner. Yet where are the books, or still better a single book, the fruit of research of a patient and reliable nature such as marks, let us say, work upon the nerves of the neck or certain types of mental functioning, to give to the educator illumination of his path that he may avoid disastrous errors and at the same time be strengthened in the conviction which comes from certainty that both the goal and the method of his task are right? There is something of pathos in continued reference to such quarter-of-a-century-old pioneer work as that of Mrs Read Mumford or in such a footnote as Dr Yeaxlee is impelled to make (p. 57) to a pamphlet issued only last year from what might reasonably be expected to be a reliable source: "But here also there is a looseness of thought and expression that is misleading, as when it is said that 'the basis of religion is fellowship.'" On the other hand, the recent inquiry referred to on p. 186 concerning the ideas of God among some three thousand elementary-school children indicates in one important direction what might be done; although here also the investigation should have been carried farther. From the field of education in general much help is still forthcoming and may be expected. Few would be able to withstand the advocacy of drawing as a means of expression in view of the fact that "the researches of Dr Hilda Oakham into children's drawings have led her to the conclusion that children cannot draw the simplest object if it has no meaning for them" (p. 60). But such contributions from those who are specifically teachers of religion are few. The need, however, for the further inquiry which they are more qualified than others to pursue is apparent throughout the book. An example may be taken from the valuable chapters dealing with adolescence. The author quotes with approval Mr M. L. Jacks' summary of the development of the religious sentiment during that period, including the passage: "It may be urged that that authority

(of God in the minds of young people) has already been rejected and that empty churches show this to be an irreligious generation. In so far as that is true it is the authority of the wrong God that has been rejected, and rightly rejected " (p. 146). At once arise the questions: Who will be a safe guide to show us why the authority of God has been rejected ? What are the real reasons why our young people confirmed in Lent have melted away by September ? Opinions are valueless. They belong to the class of idea common before aseptic surgery that to amputate a leg in thirty-four seconds or less would aid the health of the wound. What is required is that someone in his or her later twenties or early thirties should devote the next twenty years or more of life to soundly planned, adequate, convincing research, such as was undertaken in the physical realm by a Lister or a Pasteur. We might then hope for a corresponding advance in spiritual health and vigour.

If Dr Yeaxlee had done no more than quote in so representative a fashion from so wide a range of authorities he would have laid all students of education under a debt of gratitude; but he has gone much farther, for he is consistently constructive, and particularly so in the final chapters, For Parents and for Teachers. He declines throughout to accept the position that the investigation of psychological processes, valuable on all grounds as this may be, represents any finality; for final value is to be found in the intrinsic truth and worth of the undoubted contribution of religion to human life, with all that it implies.

Not only the educationist but every teacher of the Faith, clerical or lay, in school, college, parish and pulpit, must be exercised about the devotion and worship offered to God by His children of whatever age. *Worship and Education* (National Society and S.P.C.K., 2s.) is a most valuable report of a conference convened at the beginning of 1939 to discuss this subject. Within the limits imposed by the conference method the papers were searching and stimulating. The Archbishop of York presided and gave an opening and closing address, the latter a perfect example of that masterly and constructive power to summarize of which he has for long been known to many as one of the greatest living exponents. What could be more salutary than his insistence on " the accepted principle in education, that one must begin with people where they are " ? As the conference itself revealed, many forget this. Because, for example, a few parish priests have with success arranged that the worship of the parish is " centred in the Parish Communion " (p. 87), and, as nearly all would agree, " the Eucharist must be the principal Sunday morning service " and " must be fairly early because of practical reasons," it is thought to follow that in general this worship " should eventually be the Parish Communion," other celebrations being considered as additional (p. 68). In view of this, how salutary again are the Archbishop's

words: " I know of extraordinarily good people who make their communion monthly or even quarterly, and I have known of such people being seriously hurt by the plain suggestion that there was something less worthy in their form of Churchmanship than in that of those who quite constantly were present at the Holy Communion. This means that we have got to be very gentle in the ways in which we set to work to create this unity in the family life." That, indeed, is true, and more might have been said at the conference about those cases where the Parish Communion has proved a definite failure; why this has come about and why in other cases it has been an undoubted success. Was it the change of hour; the short form of preparation; the hymns; the brief address; the combination of all these; or some intense interest or atmosphere which the report has not defined, and if so what ingredients went to its creation? But all this is to touch upon one of the many vital matters raised by the report, which, like Dr Yeaxlee's book, emphasizes the need for research. The following are a few of the questions it raises. Are there definite stages in the pilgrimage of each soul to God? If corporate worship is an essential, may not that fact in all its bearings be made unmistakably clear? How are we to deal with those instances of confusion to the mind, or of pre-Christian, inadequate or false theology in our services, which now administer a stab even to the regular worshipper and for our own alienated people or to the world cast doubt upon our very sincerity? What are the many reasons, in priest and congregation, why a "special" rather than the "ordinary" service appears to send the worshipper home satisfied? In what respects can the training of priests as leaders in worship at once be improved?

The National Society has done well to arrange this conference, and all who have any responsibility for worship should study every page of the report. It shows that the Church has the requisite knowledge and ability to consider such questions as the conference raises. Has she the necessary faith, hope and love to carry them further towards their desirable conclusions?

Meanwhile, to aid worship and instruction, books of notes, some of them in story form, continue to be issued. They are often the results of actual practice, such as *Sunday Afternoon*, by Hugh Caiger (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), consisting of twenty-seven children's services, with addresses, prayers, hymns and lessons; *Festival Days*, by W. W. S. March (S.P.C.K., 1s.), on similar lines for eight of the great holy days; and Sibyl Harton's *A Child's Faith* (Mowbray, 3s. 6d.), fifty-two lessons given in a country school to children who regularly attend the Parish Communion. Mrs Graham's *Children's Worship* is used by many as a companion to the Eucharist. She has now written *Christopher* (S.P.C.K., 5s.) as a handbook of Eucharistic doctrine and an instruction in ceremonial in the form of a storybook, beautifully illustrated,

such as may be relied upon to hold the interest and enlarge the understanding of any child. *The Gospel Story*, by Canon Peter Green (Longmans, 2s. 6d.), is a short and simple narrative of the Gospels, written specially for mission schools abroad, from which readers of English anywhere may profit. Another attempt to help African and Asiatic Christians in Basic English has given us two books, now issued in ordinary English, which should prove useful to teachers and readers of the Scriptures: *The New Testament, Its Origin and Contents* (2s. 6d.), and *The Apocrypha, Their Origin and Contents* (1s.), both by E. Evans (S.P.C.K.). *The Book of Amos*, by T. H. Sutcliffe (S.P.C.K., 1s. and 1s. 9d.), should be studied by any with whom may still linger the idea that the Prophets cannot be made interesting or that this great reformer is not one of the choicest spirits of the Old Testament.

To encourage and help the beginner in the work, *Our Sunday Teaching*, by the Rev. J. R. Lumb (S.P.C.K., 1s.), is a slightly revised edition of a much earlier book, and by the same editor with six collaborators are gathered thirty-seven lessons for young people under the title *Power and Witness* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). They form the Third Annual Bible Class Book in the S.P.C.K. series, and include biblical, personal and doctrinal studies. The notes are admirably written and may be confidently recommended. As the result of an attempt to approach the Gospel story in a novel way carried out at the Whitgift Grammar School, Croydon, Ronald Gurner has written *We Crucify* (Dent, 5s.). It shows what has been done in one of the higher forms, known in the school as " Sanhedrin." This form in the previous year had made a detailed study of a Gospel on the usual lines and then, as here recorded in its " Minutes," resolved itself in imagination into the Sanhedrin, to consider, under the Presidency or High Priesthood of Mr Gurner, the tremendous happenings in Palestine nineteen hundred years ago. *Teaching of the Creed*, by G. W. Skeet (1s.), is one of a series, giving outline instruction, issued by the S.P.C.K. to aid those who withdraw children from school under the Anson Bye-Law. *After Trinity* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) consists of twenty-four talks by F. Barrie Flint on the Gospels for the Sundays after Trinity. They are primarily intended for the use of the clergy at the Children's Eucharist or other Service and should admirably serve their purpose. *The King and the Kingdom* (S.P.C.K., 2s.) is the second of a series of lessons published for the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement for the " eleven-plus " age, and they possess a much wider sweep of interest than the average collections. In *Stories of Jesus (I)* (Sheldon Press, 1s.) Walter and Hugh Kendrick have told in the language of a child of about eight years twenty-six of the Gospel stories and four imaginary ones, such as may be read to or by children for whom the biblical language is strange or difficult. On similar lines as a child's first book of Bible lessons is Mrs Watkin Williams' *Stories for Timothy*

(S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), told in language suitable for children in homes above the average. The telling of such stories as The Flood and Daniel in the Lions' Den as historical narratives, however, cannot be commended in these days. Rose Fyleman, in *A Book of Saints* (Methuen, 3s. 6d.), gives in the attractive language and style to be expected of her the life of a saint for each month of the year—a delightful book for any child.

From Roman Catholic sources come *Catechism Stories*, by F. H. Drinkwater; *The Catechism through the Gospels*, translated from the Abbé Eug. Charles; and *Sunday Instruction Notes*, by Lambert Nolle (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 2s. 6d., 5s. and 6s. respectively). The first is a companion to the English Abbreviated Catechism and has a wealth of story-illustration and interest; the second has the same purpose associated also with the Maynooth Short Catechism; and the third consists of notes of instruction for each Sunday afternoon of the year, based upon the Gospels and the Acts.

T. Grigg-Smith.

(B) POETRY

Journey to a War. By W. H. Auden and Christopher Isherwood. (Faber.) 12s. 6d.

Autumn Journal. By Louis Macneice. (Faber.) 6s.

The Still Centre. By Stephen Spender. (Faber.) 6s.

Panorama. By Walter Roberts. (Gordon Fraser, Cambridge.) 1s.

Those who have previously followed the adventures of Auden and Isherwood will find nothing very new in *Journey to a War*. But it is interesting to see in Isherwood's diary what he makes of Auden and of China in 1938. The immaturity alike of his observation and of his indignation do something to explain the strange burial of the flashes of insight which were exposed in Auden's earlier work within the wet blanket of banality that has enshrouded them in these later collaborative efforts. The descent into journalism is too easy. " As Auden said, summing it up (p. 232): ' Well, we've been on a journey with Fleming in China, and now we're real travellers for ever and ever. We need never go farther than Brighton again.' "

In Auden's poems the demon is still there, " the formless shadow in the dark," who

> " Struck down the sons who strayed into their course
> And ravished the daughters, and drove the fathers mad."

But in the last lines of his *Commentary* " the lost and trembling forces of the will " are invoked to construct a human justice:

> " The contribution of our star, within the shadow
> Of which uplifting, loving, and constraining power
> All other reasons may rejoice and operate."

In the first version of *The Ascent of F6* the same words were addressed to

> " the history and the creator
> Of all those forms in which we are condemned to suffer;
> To whom the intelligent and necessary is also the just ";

who should lead us to " the human vision . . . of one great meaning, linking the living and the dead." But " our star," " the lost and trembling forces of the will," are far more vague and shadowy. There are lines in the *Commentary* which read like a good translation of Dante. Auden has still the facility to move into a liturgical posture, but he cannot stay there, and when the posture collapses his sentiments are tame if unimpeachable:

> " It's better to be sane than mad, or liked than dreaded;
> It's better to sit down to nice meals than to nasty;
> It's better to sleep two than single; it's better to be happy."

The Chinese war and a schoolmaster's holiday do not fuse in an imitation of Dante as Iceland and another holiday mood fused in the imitation of Byron in *Letters from Iceland.*

Moreover, Macneice, who collaborated in that earlier holiday book, was a better collaborator than Isherwood. His own contributions were more carefully finished, though when he did the same kind of thing on his own in *I Crossed the Minch* some of us were moved to wonder if he could survive the kind of success which such liveliness brings. He has survived, and in *Autumn Journal* he has at last written a serious poem worthy of the promise of *Eclogue for Christmas.* He is very modest about its " overstatements and inconsistencies " in his prefatory note, but he writes: " Poetry in my opinion must be honest before anything else, and I refuse to be ' objective ' or clear-cut at the cost of honesty." He has advanced from the pose of detachment which limited his poetry in his first book of *Poems* and in the greater part of *The Earth Compels,* and recognized the necessity to defend some things short of perfection:

> " The perfectionist stands for ever in a fog
> Waiting for the fog to clear; better to be vulgar
> And use your legs and leave a blank for Hogg
> And put a cross for Lindsay "

(in the Oxford bye-election). But he knows he likes his Borzoi

dog and his seven hundred a year. He doesn't pretend to be without doubts about the future of an educated democracy:

> " It is so hard to imagine
> A world where the many would have their chance without
> A fall in the standard of intellectual living
> And nothing left that the highbrow cared about.
> Which fears must be suppressed."

He cannot always answer his own arguments, but he writes in the end:

> " To-night we sleep
> On the banks of Rubicon—the die is cast;
> There will be time to audit
> The accounts later, there will be sunlight later
> And the equation will come out at last."

If it is coming out in the record of his experiences before and during and after the September crisis, it isn't because the experiences are different from other people's, or the response so very different, but because of the delicacy and accuracy of the record. Macneice is not an interesting personality in the sense in which Auden is interesting and odd. But he is alive to most of the issues, and he does strive after a real unification of sensibility. He isn't afraid of borrowing a manner from such an unfashionable Victorian as Browning, though he is not in the least like Browning. To put it at its lowest, his poem is excellent documentation for to-day, and there is no reason why it should not be readable in fifty years' time.

Spender is the only one of the Auden-Spender-Day-Lewis trio of 1932-33 whose poetic development had been on the whole fairly continuous. If it has been disappointing it is because he really has so little to say. He says it with kisses, with a little coat, with more trains, with more cities (in Spain this time) and with another polar expedition. The explication of what he has to explain gets rather more involved.

> " Holy is lucidity
> And the mind that dare explain,"

he exclaims, and we listen with thankfulness, but

> " My will behind my weakness silhouettes
> My territories of fear, with a great sun."

The " uncreated chaos " remains formless. It is the poet's personal experience, and that alone, which has form. He would like (I think) to be like Rilkë, but he hasn't Rilkë's metaphysical concern, and the result bears a disconcerting resemblance not to Rilkë but to Rupert Brooke:

> " O, then my body would enter
> Its island and its summer

The questions find their answer
And my head its resting place
Where the other heart lies
Washed by the seas of blood."

Walter Roberts is asking other questions, questions which belong to 1939. *Panorama* is another commentary, and a very significant one, from a most interesting newcomer. He is certain that the system against which we cry is ourselves:

" Every man's brain is a Parliament of nations."

Our wrongs are " conflicts of ancient standing more sharply revealed," " diseases of minds that have lost command of themselves."

" It is certain that we of ourselves can do nothing:
The sorrowful accidental failures of the past are too much with us,
The entropy of future tangles too overwhelming.
Unlike the politician implementing his formula,
We propose no injection of issues, no stern transformation.
It is more than the restoring of balance that is at stake;
For the pendulum of self and society has gone off its rocker.
Imagine a valley full of agreeable dwellings,
Across which fate swings from the clouds by a silver cord.
Lightly it envelops the several buildings,
Transferring the cauldron of dreams to the language of action,
Recording the side-slips and over-estimates on a tablet of events.
Each day the parachute ascends with its burden of data.
Each day returns with a fresh assortment of destinies.
What are the celestial mechanics of this remarkable process ?
The soul flaps loosely on its hinges in the wings of misfortune.
Who is to set the house to rights, and strengthen the timbers ?"

Who ? " Must we point some all-round referee ?" " More understanding than the tenderest lover ?" But " Such a creator would have his own expenses to pay." " He would have to float his concern without much assistance." We are not going to set up a god, and subscribe " a percentage of our spiritual earnings." Nor would the poet suffer " any oracle stuff " from God. " We have had enough of that from the Cabinet and the economists." " Is it impossible to see without becoming grim and fatherly ?" Meanwhile he struggles with the problem of truth, " not a mineral to be won by refining." " How if the body's director were not in the brain ?" He contemplates the farthest nebula with " cold-blooded assurance ":

" There is an unobtrusive and undramatic process of merging into things
Which is legitimate and at the same time satisfying,"

for, after all, the stars have a " relative durability and freedom from decay." We have not. " We of ourselves can do nothing." The theologians should read this as more than documentation

upon the spiritual diseases of the young. It is in a very real sense a theological poem, and it could only have been written in this kind of sceptical poetry. There is something in it more complex than anything that Macneice has ever tackled or Auden ever finished. And for that reason it is an important poem, whether we judge it to be a success, or an experiment which just misses success.

George Every, S.S.M.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Lectionary of Christian Prose from the Second Century to the Twentieth Century. By A. C. Bouquet. Longmans. 10s. 6d.

Dr Bouquet expresses a hope—already justified as regards one reader—that his book may "prove a useful anthology for private reading," but he makes it quite clear that this is not his main concern. His real aim is to find non-scriptural "lessons" suitable for reading aloud at "school and college prayers . . . special Lenten services . . . guild instructions," and, indeed, at all services where scriptural lessons are not laid down by the use of our Church. He naturally disclaims any intention "to challenge or supersede the canon of the Christian Scriptures." He distinguishes rather sharply between the doctrinal and the edificatory functions of the Canon. Lessons are read to a congregation in order to edify it; not everything in the Bible edifies, and much that is not in the Bible does; hence, Dr Bouquet argues, the Church in the past has omitted parts of Scripture from the Lectionary and included non-scriptural lessons from saints' lives, the Fathers, and the like. His own book offers a preliminary selection of extracts for such a use, which he desires to see revived. I say a "preliminary" selection, partly because the editor himself modestly claims only to have "made a beginning," and partly because the actual survival of any extract under liturgical conditions must depend—as, in some sort, the formation of the Canon itself doubtless depended—on a kind of "natural selection." I very much doubt whether the rhapsodical passage from Professor Holland given on p. 43 could be endured twice by most English congregations. I doubt also whether the piece of Berkeley (p. 4) will be of much use to those who know nothing of Berkeley's system: but Dr Bouquet may reply that the Church still sees fit to tear from their context and read as epistles scraps of Pauline argument at least equally difficult. What I feel more certain of is that those who do not know the medieval meaning of "sensuality" will not be edified by Chaucer's statement (p. 134) that it ought to "have lordship over the body of man." These, however, are points of minor importance, for the collection as a whole is rich and varied, and it was not to be hoped that 100 per cent. of successes could be attained. A more serious criticism might take the form of a question: Why, in a Christian lectionary, do we find Carlyle, Emerson, R. L. Stevenson, and G. B. Shaw? Dr Bouquet's answer, I suppose, would turn once more on his distinction between doctrine and edification and on the obvious truth that many unbelievers have written what can edify Christians. As Justin Martyr says on p. 61: "Whatever all men have uttered aright belongs to us." But if this principle

is accepted, it at once raises the question whether such great pagan doctors as Plato (whom Dr Bouquet's chronological limit excludes) would not have been much more edifying than any of the unbelievers whom he has admitted. To say this is, of course, to demand that Dr Bouquet should have made a different plan, and this may be bad criticism: but I am a little uneasy lest the absence of Plato and the presence of Carlyle may encourage some readers in the false notion that the difference between pagan and Christian is somehow less important in modern than in ancient times—that no one who wore a collar and tie and trousers could really be a pagan teacher in the same way as a man in sandals and a robe. In this connexion it is, perhaps, unfortunate that the nineteenth century should be represented by more than forty authors, while the seventeenth, which comes nearest, shows only fifteen; but anyone who has tried to collect good extracts on any subject will know that this is not Dr Bouquet's fault—do what you will, that maligned and golden period is bound to top the list. Of the pagan witnesses in this book, Stevenson seems to me to bear the test of Christian surroundings better than any other.

The fate of this book as a lectionary will be decided by experience: in the meantime the reader in solitude cannot help judging it as an anthology, and as such I have found it a valuable work. No man ever agrees with another man's choice, and to disagree is one of the pleasures of using an anthology. I myself should have liked more Chesterton and von Hügel and less Robertson and Jowett, and am longing to ask Dr Bouquet, "Where is Boethius? Where (since you admit dissenters) is George Macdonald?" But this is only to say that Dr Bouquet and I are two men and not one man. I have found in his collection much edifying and pleasing work that I did not know before, and much of what I already knew and hoped to find there. The book will be useful to hundreds of readers.

If a second edition is called for I hope the editor will tell us where, in the works of its author, each passage is to be found; otherwise one of the chief uses of an anthology—that of directing us to the originals—is frustrated. I hope, too, that he will be persuaded to follow a different reading (that of the C text) in the third line of his extract from *Piers Plowman*, and, indeed, to give us the whole passage in plain prose rather than in a half-hearted attempt at the metre of the original. There are also some misprints to be corrected.

C. S. Lewis.

The Holy Spirit and the Church. By F. A. Cockin. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

In this volume, which is the fourth that has been issued in the "Diocesan Series," Canon Cockin contrasts the vivid sense of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Apostolic Church with

the vagueness and want of conviction about Him which characterizes our modern Church life. The contrast is worked out in a very searching way, and the first chapter of the book provides us with a guide for self-examination of unusual freshness and helpfulness. Seeing the need for a greater grasp of the doctrine, Canon Cockin passes on to an examination of " Spirit " in the Bible in which he shows the meaning of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father and to Jesus in language that is quite untechnical and well represents the orthodox faith. The treatment is excellent. It is strange that the chapter is entitled " What is the Spirit ?" instead of " Who is the Spirit ?"

From the Holy Spirit Canon Cockin passes on to the Church. He describes the weaknesses of us churchmen—our " introversion," our want of zeal in evangelism, our failure to make an impact upon the life of the community, and the scandal of our divisions. And where does the remedy lie ? We should have expected that, just as the remedy for our failure to live by the Spirit is to recall who the Spirit is, so also the remedy for our feeble Church life would be to learn anew what the Church is and to respond to it as a fact, about us and within us. But here Canon Cockin is disappointing. He gives us no discussion as to what the Church *is*, corresponding to his discussion of what the Spirit *is*; and as a result his treatment of defects and remedies has an unhelpfully querulous and Pelagian tone about it. This is a great pity, because we do not become better churchmen by saying to ourselves, " Poor old Church, let us try to put it right," but by realizing anew the Church as something *given* and *divine* and by responding to what it is with all our faculties.

Having neglected the question of the Church's objective meaning in the Bible, Canon Cockin is led to a dilemma. He concludes his book by asking a question which he believes to be crucial: " Is this Catholic Church [referred to in the Creed] . . . actually here and now existent, embodied in one of the historical communions ? If so, in which ? Or is it the end for which the Church was made . . ., the consummation to be won . . . by the long and painful travail of the Spirit of God, working in the soul and mind of man, breaking down his pride, melting his hardness, opening his eyes to truth ? That is the question." But, for those who have got their belief about the Church from the Bible, that is *not* the question ! We are not faced with the alternative that the Catholic Church means either a particular body, such as the Church of Rome, or else a future Church that has yet to be built. The Bible shows us that the Church exists clearly as the People or Israel of God. From the Bible we can get light upon our problems which makes Canon Cockin's dilemma seem quite irrelevant. Israel remains Israel for all its failures, and the prophets' remedy for abuses is not to doubt Israel's existence, but to remind her that she does

exist through God's deliverance and to summon her to respond to what she is. Again, we can study the way in which God's judgment falls upon His people and the judgment is blended with His saving purpose to mankind. Again, we can learn that the Church's unity is a unity of race; Christians are one through their rebirth in Christ, and when they have quarrelled their problem is not to achieve a brotherhood, but to discover that they are brethren already. But Canon Cockin never brings the biblical issues to the notice of his readers.

The meaning of " the Church " may become more and more the urgent issue for religion, as men turn from the agonies of war to the fellowship which Christ offers to them. And we shall need the deepest biblical doctrine of the Church as the People of Christ, a Christian " racialism " in answer to the pagan racialisms that are tearing men asunder. We shall have to face our failures with all the candour that Canon Cockin urges; but discussions of failures and remedies are unhelpful and misleading if their writers nowhere begin to get to grips with the biblical doctrine.

A. M. Ramsey.

John of Salisbury's Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers. Translated by Joseph B. Pike. University of Minnesota Press; Humphrey Milford. 34s.

The life and writings of John of Salisbury († 1180), whom Stubbs once called " the central figure of English learning " in his time, have received a good deal of attention within recent years. It is necessary to mention only the chapter in Lane Poole's *Illustrations of Medieval Thought*; Professor Webb's editions of the *Policraticus* and the *Metalogicon* and his admirable life of John of Salisbury in the " Great Medieval Churchmen " series; a characteristically charming essay by Miss Helen Waddell in *Essays and Studies* (vol. xiii, 1927); and, lastly, the translation, with a notable introduction, by Professor Dickinson, of the *political* sections of the *Policraticus* in Knopf's Political Science Classics. We are therefore the more indebted to Professor Pike for his workmanlike translation of the remainder of this work.

The *Policraticus*, of which the subtitle is *De Nugis Curialium et Vestigiis Philosophorum*, ranges over a wide field. It was dedicated to Becket, at that time Chancellor to Henry II, and it appeared in 1159. It begins with strictures upon hunting, gaming, " modern " music, actors and conjurors (Book I). It proceeds with a serious discussion of dreams and omens and a condemnation of astrology and divination of every kind (Book II). The political section, introduced by an attack on courtly flattery (Book III), discusses the appropriate functions in the commonwealth of the Prince, his counsellors, his magistrates, his soldiers, and the lower orders of his subjects (Books IV, V, VI). The

writer then outlines the history of ancient philosophy, awarding his own preference to the philosophers of the Academy; he explains the goal of true philosophy, and warns his readers against mundane ambition (Book VII). The discussion of vainglory, with which Book VIII opens, culminates, after a devious progress, in the justification of tyrannicide.

The work has thus a certain clumsy unity, but the directly political (Books IV-VI and the concluding sections of VII and VIII) and the indirectly political sections (Books I-III and the major portions of VII and VIII) are divisible. Professor Dickinson gave us a translation of the former; Professor Pike has now given us a translation of the latter, which, though less significant—for the writer is unfortunately much more occupied with his classical lore than with the contemporary scene—contains many points of interest and of curiosity. His resentment with the hunting set, scornful of those who " misuse any of their hunting jargon in speaking " (I, iv); his observation that " very many " physicians tend to be freethinkers (II, xxix); his remarks upon the gluttony of his age (VIII, vii); his dislike of new fashions in Church Music (I, vi); his boyhood's contact with a crystal-gazing priest (one of the few autobiographical touches in the book: II, xxviii); his rudimentary dialectics, his moderate puritanism, and the nobility of his interpretation of the theme of Jacob wrestling with the angel (VII, xiii)—all these, and many more, deserve our notice. He is, perhaps, less entertaining than Walter Map; he is at times a little prosy; here and there, particularly in his introductions, he reads like a twelfth-century Polonius. But he is profoundly English, and nowhere more so than in his comment on the Stoics (II, xxii): " Let the Stoics vaunt their startling axioms, which they call paradoxes, as being true, noble, and admirable. We with our dull wits approve nothing that appears false to everybody, or to the majority, or, especially, to individual philosophers who, in view of their ability, are more trustworthy. Nor even if Cicero himself or Aristotle should derive the impossible from the possible do I think I should acquiesce. I shall imagine that I had been mystified under the guise of truth by some deceit."

CHARLES SMYTH.

JESUS: A BIOGRAPHY. By Hugh J. Schonfield. Duckworth. 8s. 6d.

This book has, at least, a bold title. Even the general reader, for whom it is primarily intended, may be pardoned for asking why yet another Life of Jesus should be added to the number which the last hundred years has produced. The author seems to anticipate the question, and gives as his credentials a detached viewpoint, his attempt to enter into the mind of Jesus, and the

use of fresh or neglected material. The neglected material is derived, for the most part, from secondary sources which few are likely to treat as seriously as the writer. Even if we allow the possibility that the apocryphal gospels contain, here and there, a fragment of genuine tradition, it can hardly be maintained that they add anything of real value to our understanding of the life of Jesus. Mr Schonfield, however, is concerned (like every modern biographer) with the problem of " development," and anything which may be taken as throwing light on the early training of Jesus and the evolution of His ideas is eagerly seized upon. Even so it requires a fertile imagination to produce the picture we are given of the home life at Nazareth, and we can only wonder at the author's omniscience when we read that Jesus, at the critical turning-point of His ministry, suffered from insomnia, and was in fact on the verge of a nervous breakdown ! The fact is that Mr Schonfield shows little awareness of the difficulties which face the would-be biographer. The gospels, which provide almost our only evidence for the life of Jesus, are not biographies, as we understand the term to-day, and the writer who attempts a psychological analysis has set himself a task for which there is insufficient evidence. What is more serious is that any such attempt serves only to obscure the significance of the life and death of Jesus for the evangelists, and therefore for the primitive Christian community. This significance rests, of course, upon certain historical happenings, and upon the impression which Jesus made on His contemporaries, but the interest of the gospels does not lie in historical reconstruction, still less in tracing the development of a religious genius. The modern biographer who works on the assumption that it is either possible or profitable to " relate the story of a Galilean Jew," and to call this a Life of Jesus, has already committed himself to a definite standpoint from which the significance of Jesus is to be determined. It is as easy for him as for the " religious " writer to fit the Jesus of history into the framework of his own philosophy. To use the New Testament vocabulary (Kingdom of God, Son of man, etc.) as though it constituted no problem for the modern reader; to attempt to make the miracles (or some of them !) intelligible by a process of rationalization; above all, to treat the stories of Jesus as though they were capable of psychological interpretation, is to miss the point completely that the gospels form a new and distinctive type of literature which has to be treated seriously. If all this had been borne in mind, we could hardly have been told (to take only two examples) that Jesus taught by parables in order to avoid arrest (p. 147), and that His earlier view of the kingdom was that it would come by a " gradual process " (p. 177) ! We may agree with the author that the book is written in no spirit of levity, even if it is sometimes oppressively sentimental, and there is an occasional lapse of taste (*cf.* pp. 128,

130). The gospels themselves owe their dramatic power to an artlessness and restraint which it is difficult for even the well-intentioned modern biographer to sustain.

W. S. T. Wright.

Jonathan Swift: Dean and Pastor. By R. W. Jackson. S.P.C.K. 6s.

There seems to be no end of the making of books on Swift. It is a remarkable testimony to the fascination of his personality that after 200 years he can excite the interest and stir the emotions of a large public. Of how many historical personages can this be said?

This book is to be welcomed as coming from a country rectory in Ireland. Many of the Irish clergy possess both scholarship and leisure, and too few of them venture into print. Perhaps Dr Jackson's example will encourage others.

But this book is to be welcomed primarily as a serious contribution to the formation of a just estimate of Swift's personal religion. It claims to give a new picture of the man himself "as a hard-working clergyman, caring for the poor, upholding a standard of decency in worship which was then almost unknown, practising habits of prayer which he carefully concealed from the eyes of his friends."

Swift is known to many as politician and publicist rather than as dean and pastor. Dr Jackson helps to restore the balance by giving us what he calls "the secret history of a forgotten man."

This he does both negatively and positively. While recording the admitted coarseness and irreverence of much that Swift said and wrote, he ascribes them to the moral indignation of a sincere and sensitive spirit, and refutes the charges brought against him of hypocrisy and infidelity. He finds fault with some recent biographers and accuses them of "missing the real Swift in their interpretations." Dr Jackson finds the "real Swift" in his faithfulness to duty and in his quiet devotional life. We see the pastor who knows and loves his flock, the prophet who fears no man and takes immense pains with the writing and delivery of his sermons, and the priest who prepares himself and his church with care for the Holy Mysteries.

Swift was a zealous custodian of St Patrick's; he devoted himself to the upkeep and improvement of its fabric and services. Intolerant of carelessness in others, he was too honest to allow it in himself. Faithfulness to duty is a sign of grace. But when we learn that the Dean's communion book was well thumbed, that he had daily prayers with his domestic staff in his bedroom, that at their request he ministered to his friends in sickness and composed prayers for their use, it is impossible to question the sincerity of his religion. Dr Jackson may claim

too much when he writes of " that quiet devotional life, so secretly guarded and nurtured," but we can agree with him that Swift " served his God with every weapon he possessed, and thought of his ministerial calling as a position with an absolute obligation for service."

While this short book does not profess to be a complete biography, and Swift's political and literary activities are only introduced as reflecting the man behind them, it is a very useful and attractive sketch of his life and one to be commended to the general public. In writing of Swift, Dean and Pastor, Dr Jackson has also given us glimpses of the Church of Ireland and the city of Dublin in the eighteenth century. These many will appreciate.

It may be argued that he has been unwise in adding an appendix on " The Psychology of Swift." However arresting and enigmatic his personality may be, it would seem impossible to psycho-analyse a man who has been dead for 200 years !

E. L. B. Barker.

No Compromise: The Conflict between Two Worlds. By Melvin Rader. Victor Gollancz. 7s. 6d.

The two worlds are Democracy and Fascism; Mr Rader, who is Assistant Professor of Philosophy in the University of Washington, sets out to examine the political, social and philosophical doctrines of the latter, and their roots in the intellectual life of the last hundred years. In many ways this is familiar ground, but the book is well documented and a source of much useful information. It is a tribute to the zeal and intellectual drive of the Left Book Club's members that the selection committee can issue as the October choice a book which makes such considerable and sustained demands upon the reader. Would that such a standard was more in evidence within the Christian Church !

In the preface, written after war had broken out, the author regards his thesis as confirmed, that the basic conflict in the world is between Fascism and Democracy, or anti-humanism and humanism. " The humanist ideal which underlies the greatest achievements of Western culture is based upon the Greek ideal of intellectual aristocracy and the Christian ideal of democratic sharing " (p. 317). This ideal is denied by Fascism, which rejects universal truth and values and indeed universality as such. In contrast to this " the humanistic ideal must be the *integral* personality nourished by the *universal* culture " (p. 319), so that the goal of Western civilization is " the ideal of satisfying the whole man through the integration of technics, science and politics with art, ethics and an unsuperstitious religion " (p. 315).

The book is taken up with a detailed examination of the

rejection by Fascism of the liberal values of this Western civilization. Though no Marxist, the author clearly regards Fascist theories as primarily a smoke-screen for the economic interests of big business, but his reasons are sketchy. Indeed, like many Left Wing writers Professor Rader is not at home in economic analysis. Whatever may have been the origin of German Fascism, it is a serious question how far it is now out of capitalist control, and this question is not considered. Here the evidence of Rauschning's *The Revolution of Nihilism* and Drucker's *The End of Economic Man* needs consideration.

As a philosopher, the author is most concerned by the Fascist rejection of reason and its moral relativism. He argues that " the construction of ideals should involve reason and evidence " and pleads for a science of values based on three ethical intuitions: (1) that there *are* values, (2) what is the good (or evil), (3) that the good should be promoted. He proceeds to state that the good is human welfare or happiness, and that this consists in " the satisfaction of wants with the accompanying pleasure." " Just as the ideal of objective truth is a regulative principle in the field of science, so the ideal of moral objectivity is a regulative principle in the field of ethics " (p. 101), even though such a universalist ethic cannot be established by formal proof.

The Christian should feel challenged to ask himself if Professor Rader's battle for liberal and humanistic ideals is not his battle too, and whether he is not right in maintaining that their fuller realization demands the social control of economic processes. But the Christian will also ask whether these ideals can, in fact, be maintained without the Christian understanding of man, in both his sinfulness and dignity. He will note that the author is utopian in his views on Russia and on the possibilities of a new society, and indeed provides no basis for his utilitarian ethics beyond the assumption that man is worth it. He does indeed quote contemptuous references to human nature from Fascist writers, but rejects them because of the use made of them by Fascists. And this is a warning to Christians who also have drawn reactionary conclusions from the fact of human sin. The inference is surely not that some sinful man or men should be given almost unlimited power over others, but that the exercise of power by sinful men in economic and political life should be subject to democratic checks. Christians may well feel that the theological foundations of the Left need strengthening, but they can have no justification for trying to strengthen them until they have faced the challenge presented to a comfortable Church by books such as this.

RONALD PRESTON.

THE BLOOD OF THE MARTYRS. By Naomi Mitchison. Constable. 8s. 6d.

The fact that Miss Naomi Mitchison has returned to the historical novel arouses hopes that have been dashed. *In Cloud Cuckoo Land*, *The Corn King* and *The Spring Queen*, the Greek short stories and *The Conquered*, she gave us (even if she never quite succeeded in reviving the delicate splendours of Greece or the barbaric splendours of Rome) a glimpse of those inward struggles and loyalties of two ancient civilizations. *The Blood of the Martyrs*, however, is not even on the accepted model of such books—except that of course the Christian hero must be British (one wonders what Americans will do when they begin to write novels about Christian heroes in the Roman Empire) and the heroine a pagan beauty.

To Miss Mitchison the first Christians were the Marxists of the Roman world. A gigantic totalitarian State with the Prefect of the Prætorian Guard acting in the capacity of Chancellor and the Emperor as Dictator and the Empress as his evil genius, this small but mighty body of believers were the social revolutionaries against the brute force of a militaristic state. It would seem, in fact, that Beric the Briton might never have gone through " danger and bloodshed to a final terrible solution " of his problem—if that problem had not been a social one and Christianity a revolutionary doctrine. For the sons of Britons (even of a King Caradoc) might not woo the daughter of a Roman nobleman with impunity; but the social implications of the Christian doctrine knew neither Greek nor Roman—bond nor free, and so household slave led Beric to his heart's desire and his soul's salvation.

All this is very well for those who can imagine no problems in history that are not their own and who cannot conceive of the vast difference between even the same social events which disturb our world and that of the first century A.D. Such people may, perhaps even desirably (though not certainly so), be fed with milk for babes; but Miss Mitchison, whose historical sense and psychological insight are capable of giving much stronger fare, is not the person to feed them. It would almost seem that the English writer, however gifted, *cannot* touch that strong but delicate theme of the early Church in the pagan world without largely sentimentalizing it. For even *Marius the Epicurean* (despite its classical conception) compares unfavourably with *Quo Vadis* and *The Street of the Sandal Makers*—at least in regard to the major problem. The temptation to exploit an historical epoch in favour of romance is a vice of the film world and one to which we should hardly have expected Miss Naomi Mitchison to yield.

There is some good characterization in the book of a rather conventional kind, and the situations which its theme inspires are well developed and dramatized; but even here the illusion

is fatally shattered by the slapdash use of twentieth-century metaphors and phraseology and an almost American colloquialism. It may be that some will get a kick out of hearing a freedman cry, "Don't take on, kid"; but it is doubtful whether it will add anything to their conception of the Roman world in Nero's day. It was a world ripe and ready for the Christian message and the Christian martyrs; but one that would have made short shrift and a speedy tomb for the kind of "Left" assembly that Miss Mitchison imagines the Christian Church to have been.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BENHAM, COLCHESTER: G. H. Rendall, *Ben Jonson and the First Folio Edition of Shakespeare's Plays* (1s.).

B. BLACKWELL: C. J. Shebbeare, *The Problem of the Future Life* (2s. 6d.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: G. Vann, *Of His Fullness* (5s.); Lord Clonmore (Ed.), *A Christian's Christmas* (7s. 6d.).

JONATHAN CAPE: D. C. Douglas, *English Scholars* (15s.).

C.L.A.: E. Dawson, *What Every Christian Child Should Know* (1s.); *The Christian Virtues and the War*, Faith, Hope, Charity (2d. each).

CLARENDON PRESS: Sir W. David Ross, *Foundations of Ethics* (Gifford Lectures, 1935-6) (15s.); Carleton Brown (Ed.), *Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century* (10s. 6d.); R. C. Mortimer, *The Origins of Private Penance in the Western Church* (10s. 6d.).

COLDWELL: S. Feckes, *The Mystery of the Divine Motherhood* (5s. 6d.).

DACRE PRESS: E. L. Mascall, *A Guide to Mount Carmel* (3s.); Abbé de Tourville, *Letters of Direction* (2s. 6d.); Peter Winckworth, *The Way of War* (1s.); A. H. Rees, *Danger Zone Prayers* (3d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: A. V. Murray, *Personal Experience and the Historic Faith* (6s.); F. W. Lewis, *The Work of Christ* (5s.).

FABER AND FABER: T. S. Eliot, *The Idea of a Christian Society* (5s.); Winifred Peck, *Let me go Back* (7s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: *Ecclesiasticus: A New Conflation* (3s. 6d.); C. E. Raven, *The Gospel and the Church* (8s. 6d.).

I.C.F.: W. G. Peck, *War and the Christian Social Witness* (2d.).

LONGMANS: Charles Williams, *The Descent of the Dove* (7s. 6d.); L. Simmonds, *The Framework of Faith* (8s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: D. Fawcett, *Oberland Dialogues* (18s.).

MOWBRAYS: *Eucharistic Ceremonial in One-Priest Parishes* (2d.); W. J. Carey, *Straight Thinking about this War* (6d.).

R.T.S.—LUTTERWORTH PRESS: S. Nowell-Rostron, *The Challenge of Calamity: A Study of the Book of Job* (7s. 6d.).

RICH AND COWAN: Frank Morrison, *And Pilate Said* (10s. 6d.).

SCRIBNERS: F. James, *Personalities of the Old Testament* (12s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: E. Rockcliff, *Two Knights* (3s. 6d.); H. Doms, *The Meaning of Marriage* (7s. 6d.); J. K. Keydon, *The God of Reason* (5s.); J. Maritain, *A Preface to Metaphysics* (6s.); A. Thorold, *The Mass and the Life of Prayer* (3s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: H. G. Hatch, *The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus* (6s.); M. R. Loughborough, *Roumanian Pilgrimage* (4s.); J. R. Lumb (Ed.), *The Living Gospel* (2s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: E. Fenn, *Learning Wisdom* (2s. 6d.); R. A. Edwards, *City of God* (5s.); E. F. Scott, *The Book of Revelation* (6s.); Hugh Martin, *Prayers in Time of War* (2s.).

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIX

JULY TO DECEMBER, 1939

PAGE

ABERCROMBIE, N. 263
Action Française 449
ADDISON, W. G. 362, 439
ALLEN, G. 64
Anglican Theology, The Future of 406
ARMAGH, ARCHBISHOP OF 448
Art Exhibitions (G. N. Walton) 159, 379
Atonement and the Life of Human Society, The 176
Australia, Theological Thought in 309
Axioms of a Catholic Christology, Some 106

BALFOUR, R. E. 449
BELGION, M. 285
BERWICK, G. 193, 276
BETHELL, S. L. 24, 450
Biblical Theology, The Nature of 166

BOOKS REVIEWED:

Barth, *Church and State* (Cobham and Gordon) 314
Bishop of Burnley, *Bishop Seaton of Wakefield* (B. K. Cunningham) . 317
Blackstone, *The Ferrar Papers* (A. R. V.) 72
Bouquet, *A Lectionary of Christian Prose* (C. S. Lewis) . . . 467
Bowman, *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion* (W. J. S. Simpson) . 153

Cammack, *Moral Problems of Mental Defect* (L. F. Browne) . . 394
Cockin, *The Holy Spirit and the Church* (A. M. Ramsey) . . . 468
A Comprehensive Church (A. G. Hort) 398

d'Arcy, *Thomas Aquinas : Selected Writings* (A. M. Farrer) . . 319
Demant, *The Religious Prospect* (J. H. Oldham) 313
d'Entrèves, *The Medieval Contribution to Political Thought* (Charles Smyth) 78
Dewick, *The Indwelling God* (R. H. L. Slater) 232
du Plessis, *The Human Caravan* (T. R. Milford) 238

Elliott, *Humanism and Imagination* (S. L. Bethell) 392

Fraenkel, *Death is Not Enough* (A. Sampson) 397

Gavin, *Seven Centuries of the Problem of Church and State* (Charles Smyth) 152
Handbook of Christian Teaching (W. J. Brown) 75
Haslehurst, *How to Read the Bible Aloud* (E. L. Mascall) . . 79
Hawkins, *Hawk among the Sparrows* (R. G. Lunt) . . . 237
Howe and le Mesurier, *The Open Way* (L. W. Grensted) . . 155

Jackson, *Jonathan Swift: Dean and Pastor* (E. L. B. Barker) . . 473
Joyce, *Finnagan's Wake* (A. Sampson) 157

Kirk, *The Study of Theology* (W. L. Knox) 149
Knox, *St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* (J. M. Creed) . . 68

Leahy, *St Augustine on Eternal Life* (J. Burnaby) 71
Lewis, *Rehabilitations* (B. Blackstone) 73
Lubbock, *M. R. James* (E. G. Selwyn) 236

Mackintosh, *Sermons* (W. Perry) 158
Mitchison, *The Blood of the Martyrs* (A. Sampson) . . . 476

Nash, *Education for Christian Marriage* (L. Hodgson) . . . 147
Nédoncelle, *Newman's Apologia* (A. R. V.) 239

Pike, *John of Salisbury's Frivolities of Courtiers* (Charles Smyth) . 470

Rader, *No Compromise* (R. Preston) 474

Schonfield, *Jesus : A Biography* (W. S. T. Wright) . . . 471
Slater, *God of the Living* (C. D. Waddams) 316

PAGE

Tate, *The Fathers* (M. Belgion) 76
Tillyard and Lewis, *The Personal Heresy* (G. Every) . . . 151
Warner, *Youth in Action* (M. Stockwood) 395
Westermarck, *Christianity and Morals* (G. Seaver) 230
World Mission of the Church (J. A. Ramsbotham) 234

BRANDRETH, H. R. T. 387

CARLETON, G. D. 187
China, Theology in 64
Christianity and the Public Schools 128
"CINEAS" 42
CLARKE, W. K. L. 49, 110
Close of Cheltenham 193, 276
COLLINS, L. J. 138
Comment on Periodicals 52, 215, 301, 378, 452
Corporate Worship as an Expression of Community 35
Correspondence 50, 134, 373, 452

Dante's Teaching on the Mystery of Redemption 94
DEANESLEY, M. 299
Declining Population, A 127
Demant and Karl Barth, Mr 412
Devotional Literature, Recent 56
Dickens and the Church, Charles 110
Divites Dimisit 421
Doctrine Report and the Sacraments, The 344
DREWETT, J. 35
DURNFORD, F. H. 354

Ecclesiastical Courts, The 42
Ellis, Havelock : Philosopher of Humanism 114
Ethics, Some Recent Books on 382

"Fact" and "Significance" in the Gospels 371
False Gods : A Biblical Reverie 49
FARRER, AUSTIN 371
France : A Congress of Philosophers 60
French Literature Now 285

Germany, A Visit to 296
Gladstone, Church, State and Mr 362, 439
God Speed the Plough 212
Grace and Human Nature 263
GRAY, G. F. S. 86
GUTBROD, W. H. 123

HART, H. ST J. 221
HEYWOOD, H. C. L. 382
HODGSON, L. 176
HUBBARD, H. L. 56

India 225

Japanese Christianity, Trend of Thought in 140
JENKINS, D. 412
Jesus and the Law 123
Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne 430
Justice and Love 5

MCADOO, H. R. 430
MASCALL, E. L. 406
MICKLEWRIGHT, F. H. A. 114
Missionary Literature, Recent 304
Moral Theology 424

PAGE

New Testament, Some Recent Books on the 138
Nursery of Christian Ecumenism, A 257

Old Testament, Some Recent Books on the 221

Pagan World, Our 333
PARKER, J. W. 212
PARKER, T. M. 14
PATON, W. 257
PEACEY, J. R. 225
PITTENGER, W. N. 106
Poetry 462
Poetry and Belief 24
Possessing our Possessions 247
Providence and Prayer 450

QUICK, O. C. 5, 344

REDPATH, L. 94
Religious Education : The Need for Research 458
Reunion, The Literature of 387
RICHARDSON, A. 166
Rome and Biblical Criticism 14

SAMPSON, A. 201
SANSBURY, C. K. 140
Scriptural Evangelism 187
SHIRLEY, F. J. 128
Should a State be Neutral in Regard to Religion? 86
STEWART, M. B. 424
Swift and the Modern Mind 201

Theology To-day 326

WARREN, M. A. C. 247, 304
WATTS, G. S. 309
WEDEL, T. O. 333
Wesley, The Hymns of Charles 354
Why did the Friars Fail? 299
Why we are at War 448
WILLIAMS, C. 421

YORK, ARCHBISHOP OF 326

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher